Long live the king!

Chapter 3

Long Live the King! The Ideology of Power between Ritual and Morality in the *Gongyang zhuan* 公羊傳[1]

Joachim Gentz

> C'est à l'idéologie, à cette ténébreuse métaphysique qui, en recherchant avec subtilité les causes premières, veut sur ces bases fonder la législation des peuples, au lieu d'approprier les lois à la connaissance du cœur humain et aux leçons de l'histoire, qu'il faut attribuer tous les malheurs.
> Napoléon at the Conseil d'Etat in 1812

[L1] Background: Origins and Early History of the *Gongyang zhuan*

Along with the *Zuo zhuan* 左傳 and the *Guliang zhuan* 穀梁傳, the *Gongyang zhuan* 公羊傳 is one of the three canonical commentaries to the *Chunqiu* 春秋 (*Spring and Autumn Annals*). The *Chunqiu* in turn belongs to the wider genre of annalistic chronicles that were kept at the courts of many states during the Zhou 周 period (ca. 1046–256 BCE)[2] and recorded events

[1] Parts of this essay draw on my earlier German publication, Gentz 2001. I wish to thank the editors for their careful reading, constructive suggestions, and patience, Yuri Pines especially for his enormous input of expertise and effort (he surely is the god in the details of this essay), Elizabeth Leith for her attentive proofreading, and Pamela J. Burton for her meticulous and intelligent final polish.

[2] Hereafter all the dates are BCE (before the Common Era) unless indicated otherwise.

that were of significance for the state.[3] The *Chunqiu*, which became one of the five core Confucian works in the fourth or third century BCE, is a chronicle of the state of Lu 魯 covering the period from 722 to 481. In the view of the *Gongyang zhuan* it was compiled by Confucius[4] from earlier versions of one or several unedited *Chunqiu* chronicle(s)[5] (*buxiu Chunqiu* 不脩春秋),[6] the historical substance of which it basically preserved. Yet the *Gongyang zhuan* believes that Confucius formulated the transmitted historical records in particular ways in order to indicate his judgments on the contents of the records as subtle moral messages to posterity. As these moral judgments made by Confucius seem to combine the deep wisdom of his historical knowledge with his sage-like moral sense, they are regarded as an invaluable resource for study. The *Gongyang* commentary endeavors to detect the hidden messages by analyzing in particular the wording of the *Chunqiu* records, especially where it deviates from the normal pattern of the historiographical rules according to which the

---

[3] *Mozi jiaozhu* VIII.31: 337–339 ("Ming gui xia" 明鬼下); *Guoyu jijie* 17.1: 485 ("Chuyu 楚語 shang") and 13.8: 415 ("Jinyu 晉語 7"); *Zhuangzi jinzhu* 2: 74 ("Qiwu lun" 齊物論); and *Mengzi yizhu* 8.21: 192 all refer to annalistic chronicles held at the courts of other states such as Zhou 周, Yan 燕, Song 宋, Qi 齊, Chu 楚, and Jin 晉. See Gentz 2001: 25–37. The "wooden planks for the yearly records" 記年之牒 mentioned in *Han Feizi jijie* VIII.29: 210 ("Dati" 大體) could also refer to similar works.

[4] My assertion that this is an assumption of the *Gongyang* text itself is mainly based on the commentary in Zhao 12.1 where "*zi yue*" 子曰 clearly refers to Confucius as he refers to himself as "Qiu" 丘 at the end of the quote. In this quote he explicitly states that he is responsible for the wording of the *Chunqiu* 其詞則丘有罪焉耳！ For a translation of this passage see n. 90 below.

[5] The historical records on which the *Chunqiu* is allegedly based are often called *shiji* 史記 in the early literature; see Wang Liqi 1989: 107–109.

[6] See *Gongyang zhuan* (hereafter *GYZ*), Zhuang 7.2 (Liu Shangci 2011 [hereafter Liu 2011]: 120, *Shisanjing zhushu* edition [hereafter *SSJZS*], 6: 2228).

main parts of the *Chunqiu* are written.[7] This intellectual attempt to explain the text according to reasoned rules had a lasting impact on traditional Chinese historiography and its interpretation.[8] Its new exegetical methodology also influenced legal interpretation and contributed to a new style of communication in the political sphere.

[L2] Dating of the *Gongyang zhuan*

The place of origin of the *Gongyang zhuan* is unknown, as are the date and the authors and/or transmitters; therefore, highly controversial positions regarding the date and transmission of the *Gongyang zhuan* exist in the secondary literature.[9] The earliest and thus official version of the *Gongyang* transmission line is given by the Later Han 後漢 (25–220 CE) scholar Dai Hong 戴宏 (fl. ca. during the reign of Emperor An 漢安帝, 106–125 CE)[10] in the preface to his now-lost *Jieyi lun* 解疑論 (*Essay on the Explanation of Textual Ambiguities*).[11]

---

[7] For an analysis of the prescriptive rules governing which types of events could be recorded as well as the form of those records, see Van Auken 2007. Van Auken basically confirms the observations of the *Chunqiu* commentaries. For a much more detailed analysis, see Duan Xizhong 2002: 151–404.

[8] Durrant 1995: chap. 1 and pp. 59–68; Watson 1958: 85–100; Lei Jiaji 1990: 30–50.

[9] Hama Hisao (1987: 76–78; 1992: first and second part of chap. 1) surveys the Chinese and Japanese positions.

[10] Ma Guohan 1990: vol 3, 308. More details can be found in Yamada Taku 1957: 172.

[11] Some fragments of this work are collected in Ma Guohan 1990: vol. 3, 308–309. See also Xu Fuguan 1982. A special investigation by Yoshikawa Kōjirō (1966) is listed in the bibliography of Arbuckle 1993. The earliest transmission of the relevant passage from the *Jieyi lun*, however, is in a quotation in Xu Yan's 徐彦 (Tang dynasty) subcommentary to the preface of He Xiu's 何休 (129–182 CE) *Chunqiu Gongyang jiegu* 春秋公羊解詁 (*SSJZS* 2190). The earliest definitive datable statement concerning the transmission of the *Gongyang zhuan* is therefore in He Xiu's commentary on the second year of Lord Yin of the *Gongyang*

According to Dai Hong, the *Gongyang zhuan* was first transmitted *orally* (mostly from father to son) in the following order: Confucius's disciple Zixia 子夏 (b. 507); Gongyang Gao 公羊高; Gongyang Ping 公羊平; Gongyang Di 公羊地; Gongyang Gan 公羊敢; Gongyang Shou 公羊壽. During the time of Emperor Jing 漢景帝 (r. 157–141), it was then written down on bamboo and silk (著於竹帛) by Shou's student Huwu Zidu 胡毋子都, who is often referred to as Master Huwu (Huwu sheng 胡毋生). Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (ca. 195–115) finally added diagrams and prognostic explanations (*tu chen* 圖讖).[12] This line of transmission is not entirely reliable for several reasons. First, it lists only five transmitters from the Gongyang family in the three-hundred-year period between Zixia's maturity and Emperor Jing.[13]

---

zhuan (*SSJZS* 2: 2203). He proposes the same oral transmission line as Dai Hong does, ascribing the written version of the *Gongyang zhuan* on bamboo and silk (*ji yu zhubo* 記於竹帛) to a certain Mister Gongyang and his students Master Huwu 胡毋生 et al. On the basis of this evidence, there is no reason to doubt the Dai Hong quotation by Xu Yan, and this quotation is even more complete than the passage in He Xiu's commentary. For a detailed discussion, see Jiang Youyu 2005: 112–118.

[12] See Dai Hong's preface as quoted in Xu Yan's subcommentary in *SSJZS* 2190. Nobody knows to what kind of diagrams or prognostic explanations the text refers here, as nothing of this sort has been transmitted.

[13] This has also been noticed by Cui Shi 崔適 (1852–1924) in his *Chunqiu fushi* 春秋復始: "Zixia was 44 years younger than Confucius. Confucius was born in the twenty-first year of the reign of Lord Xiang [552]. Down to the beginning of the reign of Emperor Jing [r. 157–141] there are more than 340 years. Between Zixia and Gongyang Gao there are only five transmissions, so in the Gongyang family the interval from generation to generation must have been more than 60 years. Every father must have enjoyed an old age, and the sons must all have been wise from birth. Is it credible that this can be achieved?" 子夏少孔子四十四歲。孔子生於襄公二十一年，則子夏生於定公二年。下迄景帝之初三百四十餘年。自子夏至公羊壽，甫及五傳，則公羊世世相去六十餘年；又必父享耄年，子皆夙慧，乃能及

Second, the *Gongyang zhuan* quotes six *Chunqiu* masters who do not appear in this line.[14] Third, *Shiji* 史記 and *Hanshu* 漢書 both report the oral transmission of *Chunqiu* interpretation by Confucius's disciples, but neither mentions a written text. Fourth, oral transmission lines reaching back to Confucius were frequently invented during Dai Hong's time.

The *Gongyang zhuan* is a compilation consisting of clearly distinguishable parts.[15] A core exegetical text composed of distinct parts such as glosses, ritual rules, and general exegetical guidelines can be distinguished from historical narratives and later exegetical supplements inserted into the exegetical text. This core piece originated probably in the time span between Mengzi's 孟子 late years (ca. 320) and the death of Han Fei 韓非 (233), but most probably at the beginning of the third century BCE in the state of Qi 齊 during the reign of King Xuan 齊宣王 (r. 320–301) or King Min 齊閔王 (r. 301–284)[16] in the intellectual

---

之，其可信乎？ (Cui Shi 1918: vol. 1, 1b). Qian Mu (1985: 86–87) even doubts that a Gongyang family existed at all and argues that the Gongyang line is the product of wrongly transmitted references to Zengzi's 曾子 disciples Gongming Gao 公明高 and Gongming Yi 公明儀.

[14] The masters are Luzi 魯子, Zi Shenzi 子沉子, Zi Simazi 子司馬子, Zi Beigongzi 子北宮子, Zi Nüzi 子女子, and Gaozi 高子. Nothing is known about them. According to the "Gujin renbiao" 古今人表 of the *Hanshu* (20: 947–948), they all were active in the twenty years between 300 and 280, during the reigns of Lord Min/Wen of Lu 魯愍/文公 (r. ca. 302–280) and King Min of Qi 齊愍王 (r. 301–284). A number of studies discuss these historiographers; e.g., Qian Mu 1985: 272–274; Sagawa 1960: 48–50; Yamada 1957: 157–164.

[15] See my analysis in Gentz 2001: 372–377. See also the analyses in Yamada 1957: 164–172; Hihara 1976: 42–43; Noma 1996: 105–108; Sekiguchi 1976: 16–21.

[16] The optimistic *Gongyang* vision of an ideal system based on transmitted Zhou rules was probably conceptualized in the time of Qi's relative strength between 334, when Lord Wei of

context of Jixia 稷下 scholars.[17] It might have started as an oral tradition of *Chunqiu* interpretations that accumulated layers of interpretation by different exegetical authorities during the third and first half of the second centuries. At a certain point in time the core text of the *Gongyang zhuan* was fixed, orally or in written form. Its exegesis of the *Chunqiu* makes partially use of written material such as glossary lists, ritual-administrative rules, and historical narratives.[18] The literarization of the exegetical tradition was probably finalized during the reign of Emperor Jing (r. 157–141). This finalization should probably be understood as purely a work of compilation, a last unification accomplished by selection and cutting of older materials without otherwise changing their contents or adding anything substantial to them: the last record might have been modified to serve as a kind of postface.

Qi assumed the title of king, and before 284, when Qi was defeated by the unified armies of the states Yan 燕, Qin 秦, Han 韓, Zhao 趙, and Wei 魏, a defeat from which it never recovered (Yang Kuan 1998: 381–385; *Shiji* 46: 1900). It appeared most probably during the reign of King Xuan, who demanded and promoted the creation of such unitary visions, or during the reign of his successor, King Min.

[17] Little is known about how scholarship was organized during the Warring States period. All we know about scholars in Qi in the third century BCE is that some of the most brilliant minds were sponsored by the ruling Tian family and that their center, located by the capital's Jixia gate, was important and influential. See Liu Weihua and Miao Runtian 1992; Zhang Bingnan 1991. Sivin (1995) and Lloyd and Sivin (2002: 29–30) have criticized the term "Jixia Academy" as inappropriate because the scholars were dependent guests and did not conduct independent scientific study.

[18] For glossary lists, see, e.g., *Erya* 爾雅 for *Shijing* 詩經 and *Shangshu* 尚書 exegesis, and the "Shuo gua" 說卦 and "Za gua" 雜卦 chapters for *Yijing* 易經 exegesis. For ritual-administrative rules, see, e.g., the "Quli xia" 曲禮下 and "Wang zhi" 王制 chapters of the *Liji* 禮記, sections of the eponymous chapter in *Xunzi* 荀子, and the surviving fragments of the lost *Wangdu ji* 王度記. For historical narratives, see, e.g., *Zuo zhuan* and *Guoyu*.

The *Chunqiu* exegesis that appears in the first five chapters of the *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露 (probably authored by Dong Zhongshu or Huwu Zidu) is based on this last compilation.

[TL2] Missing Han Themes in the *Gongyang zhuan*

This last compilation of this *Chunqiu* exegetical tradition, which was called *Gongyang zhuan* only much later,[19] provided one of the most powerful ideological instruments of Former Han 前漢 (206/202 BCE–9 CE) Confucianism. The *Gongyang zhuan* does not, however, reflect an ideology that is particular to the Former Han. A number of missing central themes and terms prompt this conclusion. Also, the *Gongyang zhuan*'s emphasis on political unity is often cited as major evidence for a Former Han date, but it seems to be derived from pre-Han discourse.

The themes discussed in the *Gongyang zhuan* nowhere reflect the concrete situation of the early Han. None of the *Gongyang*'s rules regarding succession to the throne, for example, match the problems that were so prominent in the Former Han after the death of the first emperor, Emperor Gao 高帝 (r. 206/202–195). Immediately after Emperor Gao's death, Empress Lü 呂后 dominated the palace and government for about fifteen years (195–180), trying to manipulate the succession in favor of her natal family and to oust the Liu family. Although this nearly brought the dynasty to an end, there is no reflection of any analogous problem in the *Gongyang zhuan*. After the expulsion of the Lü family, the imperial succession was again uncertain, as three possible candidates existed whose respective claims to succession could not be decided on the grounds of consensual succession rules.[20] Again, the *Gongyang zhuan* does not address this problem in any way. Neither does the *Gongyang zhuan*

[19] Cui Shi (1918: vol. 1, 1b) argues that it was first called *Gongyang zhuan* by Liu Xin 劉歆 (ca. 50 BCE–23 CE) in his *Qi lüe* 七略.

[20] *Hanshu* 4: 105ff. and 38: 1987ff.; Loewe 1986: 130–137.

provide any rules regulating other pressing issues of the Former Han such as obligations of the regional lords (*zhuhou* 諸侯) to attend the Son of Heaven's court, taxation,[21] or the increasing bureaucratization of the state, all of which became major problems under Emperors Wen 漢文帝 (r. 180–157) and Jing (Loewe 1986: 140). Moreover, there is no reflection of what the *Shiji* presents as two different styles of government: namely, the laissez-faire policy of the so-called Huang-Lao 黃老 party, which opposed an expansionist policy against the Xiongnu and supported the rights of the enfeoffed kings, versus a faction of Ru 儒 ("Confucians") and reformists who supported the fight against the Xiongnu and curtailment of the kings' power (Van Ess 1993: 16–17). While the *Gongyang zhuan* was endorsed by the faction of the Ru, it contains neither polemic against Huang-Lao policy nor any advocacy of an aggressive fight against Yi-Di 夷狄 "barbarians" or of the regulation of enfeoffed kings, nor any sympathy for reformist politics whatsoever. There is no hidden polemic against the Qin or any discussion of harsh punishments, topics that circulated in most prominent ideological discourses from late Warring States (Zhanguo 戰國, 453–221) times until the beginning of the Former Han.

[L3] Magnification of Unified Rule

The ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan* has often been identified with Former Han ideology because of its famous notion of the "magnification of the unified rule" (*da yitong* 大一統) in the very first record.[22]

---

[21] The one passage on taxation, in Xuan 15.8, is reminiscent of a parallel passage in *Mengzi* 12.10. Both passages seem to echo the same discourse, which in its simplicity clearly does not reflect the complexity of early Han discourses on taxation.

[22] Liu 2011: 1; *SSJZS* 1: 2196–2197.

Chunqiu (hereafter *CQ*): 元年， 春，王正月。

First year, spring, the king's first month.

Gongyang zhuan (hereafter *GYZ*): 元年者何？君之始年也。春者何？歲之始也。王者孰謂？謂文王也。曷為先言王而後言正月？王正月也。何言乎王正月？大一統也。

What is the first year? It is the year in which the reign of the ruler [of Lu] begins. What is spring? It is the beginning of the year. King refers to whom? It refers to King Wen. Why does it first say "king" and then say "first month"? It is the first month of the [Zhou] royal calendar. Why does it say the "first month" of the [Zhou] royal calendar? To magnify the unified rule.

This unified rule is taken by later commentators to refer to the unity achieved after the unification of the Qin and Han empires. Yet, as Yuri Pines (2000a) has shown, the paradigm of political unity emerged long before actual unity was realized in 221 BCE, and this "quest for unity was almost unanimously endorsed by Zhanguo thinkers" (2000a: 311). Pines (2000a: 304, 311) enumerates various strands of argumentation in the Warring States period ideology, which supported political unification of "All-under-Heaven" (*tianxia* 天下). The *Gongyang zhuan* differs from these strands, yet it has certain parallels in Warring States literature in texts such as the *Zhou shi tian fa* 周食田法 (*Regulations for Zhou Food Fields*),[23] a work predating 295 BCE (Yang Bojun 1979: 68), and the *Wangdu ji* 王度記

[23] This text was looted in ca. 279 CE from the tomb of King Xiang of Wei 魏襄王 (r. 318–296) at Ji 汲 Commandery, Henan, (together with the *Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年 [*Bamboo Annals*] and many other texts). See *Jinshu* 36: 1061 and 51: 1433. For a critical introduction

(*Records of the Monarch's Measurements*). The *Wangdu ji* was probably compiled during the reign of King Xuan of Qi (r. 320–301) in the context of Jixia scholarship[24] and was incorporated later as a chapter in the *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記. Today only nine quotations from the *Wangdu ji* survive. They can be found in the *Baihu tong* 白虎通 (*Comprehensive Discussions at the White Tiger Hall*) and in commentaries on the classics and dynastic histories (Gu Jiegang 1979: 7; He Xichun 1966: 4–6). These fragmentary pieces indicate that the *Wangdu ji* must have been a work consisting, like the later "Wang zhi" 王制 chapters, of ritual and administrative gradations of official ranks, endowments, and salaries and an overall order of institutional posts. One of its nine quotations corresponds rather closely to a rule from the *Gongyang zhuan*:

Wangdu ji 王度記:[25]	天子一娶九女 The Son of Heaven takes nine women as wives all at once.
GYZ, Zhuang 19.3:[26]	諸侯壹聘九女 The regional lords take nine women as wives

---

to the so-called Jizhong 汲冢 discovery, see Shaughnessy 2006: 131–184. Shaughnessy notes that there is "no subsequent record of the *Zhou shi tian fa*" (178).

[24] See Liu Xiang 劉向, *Bielu* 別錄, quoted in the subcommentary of Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648 CE) to the *Liji* (*SSJZS* 43: 1566). Liu Xiang ascribes the work to the intellectual circle around the Jixia scholar Chunyu Kun 淳于髡. Chunyu's *Shiji* biography, however, does not contain any reference to such a work (*Shiji* 74: 2347). Chunyu Kun is sometimes listed with a number of other Jixia scholars in the *Shiji* (46: 1894, 74: 2346, etc.), in the context of which Liu Xiang wants to place the *Wangdu ji*.

[25] Quoted in *Baihu tong* 10:469 ("Jia qu" 嫁娶).

[26] Liu 2011: 144; *SSJZS* 8: 2236.

all at once.

According to Gu Jiegang (1979), the *Wangdu ji* is one of many programmatic conceptions of a unified empire, which comprised elaborations of concrete details for a bureaucratic hierarchical order. In an article on the genesis of the *Zhouli* 周禮, Gu points out a number of such early conceptions of political orders in the books *Mengzi*, *Xunzi* 荀子, and particularly *Guanzi* 管子. According to Gu, these conceptions may count as precursors of the order of offices in the *Zhouli*. These concepts, which, according to Gu, were mainly developed in the Jixia context of Qi, expressed the aspirations of Qi rulers for a unified rule over the Chinese territories in the pragmatic form of administrative regulations. Gu interprets them as the earliest concrete designs of a centrally administered unified empire in Chinese history. We thus find in pre-Han texts from Qi—which closely resemble the *Gongyang zhuan* in content, style, and attitude—an early vision of a unified central state that is based on ritual and administrative rules.[27]

A new wave of texts focusing on a ritual-based political unity emerged at the beginning of the Han. Texts like the "Wang zhi" chapter of the *Liji* 禮記 (as well as a section of an eponymous chapter in the *Xunzi*)[28] reflect a similar scholarly effort to create appropriate

[27] The excavated text *Tianzi jian zhou* 天子建州 from the Shanghai Museum collection includes similar passages in which the different ritual prerogatives of the Son of Heaven 天子, the rulers of the states 邦君, the noble officers 大夫, and the *shi* officers 士 are clearly distinguished.

[28] The "Wang zhi" chapters consist mainly of administrative and ritual rules and regulations concerning institutional structures, offices and their obligations, tasks, and emoluments, official titles and designations, units of measurement, clothing, ritual procedures, hunting, sacrifices and music, social organization and care, legal instructions (punishments),

delineations of a unified central state based on transmitted Zhou dynasty ritual and administrative rules that are partly copied, partly emulated, partly extended, and partly amended to match Former Han political needs (Wang Baoxuan 1994). These early Han texts, however, differ from the Warring States period works in several respects. First, the Han texts are given different titles. Early works designate their political systems as *fa* 法 (regulations, schemes),[29] such as the *Zhou shi tian fa* 周食田法, or as *du* 度 (measures), as in *Wangdu ji* 王度記. Early Han texts use the term *zhi* 制 (institutions), as in the "Wang zhi" chapters (in the *Xunzi* and *Liji*) and texts commissioned under Emperor Wen (r. 180–157): "Ben zhi" 本制, "Bing zhi" 兵制, "Fu zhi" 服制,[30] and the *Liji* "Sangfu sizhi" 喪服四制 chapter. Second, as Legge (1976: 19) and Gu (1979: 25) have pointed out, in Han times the emperor's position could not be listed in a sequence together with subordinate positions. He had to be listed outside the hierarchical sequence in order to mark his extraordinary position.

The *Gongyang zhuan*'s vision of a ritually unified realm clearly belongs to the first of these strands. It relates its many ritual rules to early visions of unification, which it refers to as "King Wen's regulations and measures" (*Wen wang zhi fadu* 文王之法度).[31] Both *fa* and *du* appear here as terms denoting a royal system; the term *zhi* 制, which is so prominent in Han

---

geography, distribution of land and property, and education. They claim to provide details of the Zhou state that should serve the ruler as a basis from which to govern a unified state.

[29] "Administrative regulations are extremely important in our contemporary bureaucracies. Such rules, handed down by a multitude of regulatory agencies, probably have a greater impact on the lives of most of us than does what we call 'law.' In China, however, these have been included in what is called 'law'" (Creel 1974: 143). For a detailed discussion of the term *fa* in Zhanguo times, see Goldin 2011a.

[30] See Liu Xiang's *Bielu* and the expanded version of this bibliographical record, the *Qi lüe* 七略 by his son Liu Xin 劉歆, in Ma Guohan 1990: vol. 6, 158.

[31] Wen 9.1 (Liu 2011: 301; *SSJZS* 13: 2269).

texts, is used only once in the *Gongyang zhuan*, as a verb in the last record referring to the gentleman's compilation of the *Chunqiu* (*zhi Chunqiu* 制春秋).

This evidence might suffice to refute the argument that the emphasis on political unity in the *Gongyang zhuan* reflects Former Han political ideology. It appears much more plausible to regard the *Gongyang zhuan* itself as a variant of these early visions of a rule-based unity in the intellectual context of the Qi court. Referring to the old Zhou ritual and administrative system, the *Gongyang zhuan* envisions a continuation of the cultural unity of the Zhou, when the Son of Heaven ruled over his œcumene (*tianxia* 天下), with no place lying outwith his dominion (the formulation *wangzhe wuwai* 王者無外—"nothing is external to the [true] King"—is used four times in the *Gongyang zhuan*),[32] and it takes a strongly relativist attitude toward notions of interior (*nei* 內) and exterior (*wai* 外) or to differences between Central States (Zhongguo 中國) and Yi-Di 夷狄 "barbarians."[33]

[L3] Interior and Exterior Realms

The envisioned unity is not the unity of the Han state, which defends and expands its borders against non-Han people. It is rather the vision of an empire without political borders that is defined on cultural grounds. The borders that have to be drawn and defended are cultural borders, and the belonging to interior or exterior realms is gradual and depends on the perspective of the historiographer, as pointed out in Cheng 15.12,[34] in a passage that indicates that the *Gongyang zhuan* is aware of the contradiction between the vision of a unified realm

[32] Yin 1.6 (Liu 2011: 10; *SSJZS* 1: 2200); Huan 8.6 (Liu 2011: 76; *SSJZS* 5: 2219); Xi 24.4 (Liu 2011: 249; *SSJZS* 12: 2259); Cheng 12.1 (Liu 2011: 410; *SSJZS* 18: 2295).

[33] For a discussion on "how to distinguish between civilized states and barbarians" in the *Gongyang zhuan*, see Yu 2010, 105–107.

[34] Liu 2011: 417; *SSJZS* 18: 2297.

and the separation into interior and exterior realms:

> *CQ*: 冬十有一月，叔孫僑如會晉士燮、齊高無咎、宋華元、衛孫林父、鄭公子鰌、邾婁人，會吳于鐘離。
>
> Winter, eleventh month. Shusun Qiaoru joined Shi Xie of Jin, Gao Wujiu of Qi, Hua Yuan of Song, Sun Linfu of Wei, Gongzi Qiu of Zheng, and an officer of Zhulou in meeting with Wu at Zhongli.
>
> *GYZ*: 曷為殊會吳？外吳也。曷為外也？《春秋》內其國而外諸夏，內諸夏而外夷狄。王者欲一乎天下。曷為以外內之辭言之。言自近者始也。
>
> Why is “meeting Wu” set apart [from the sequence of the other participants]? To present Wu as exterior. Why is it presented as exterior? The *Chunqiu*, when presenting its own state as interior, presents other Central States as exterior. When it presents the Central States as interior, it presents the Yi-Di as exterior. Now, if the true king desires unity in All-under-Heaven, why does it then talk [about All-under-Heaven] by employing the terms “interior” and “exterior”? When it talks [about All-under-Heaven,] it starts from the perspective of what is near.

There are numerous examples where the *Gongyang zhuan* draws a clear line between the Central States and excludes the Yi-Di from the community of states belonging to the Zhou ritual realm. The Yi-Di are not permitted to act within the ritual code of the Zhou, in which they have neither place nor position, nor are they allowed to disturb the ritual order at all:

> *CQ*: 邾婁人、牟人、葛人來朝。
>
> Men from Zhulou, from Mu, and from Ge came for an audience.
>
> *GYZ*: 皆何以稱人？夷狄之也。

Why are they all called “men”? To mark them as Yi-Di.[35]

CQ: 秋。宋公、楚子、陳侯、蔡侯、鄭伯、許男、曹伯會于霍。執宋公以伐宋。

In autumn, the Duke of Song, the Viscount of Chu, the Marquis of Chen, the Marquis of Cai, the Earl of Zheng, the Baron of Xu, and the Earl of Cao had a meeting in Huo. The Duke of Song was seized and thereupon they invaded Song.

GYZ: 孰執之。楚子執之。曷為不言楚子執之。不與夷狄之執中國也。

Who seized him? The Viscount of Chu seized him. Why does it not say that the Viscount of Chu seized him? It is not permissible for Yi-Di to seize [members of] the Central States.[36]

Nevertheless, the *Gongyang zhuan* recognizes that the status of a Yi-Di state can change, albeit gradually, over time:

CQ: 冬，楚子使椒來聘。

Winter, the Viscount of Chu sent Jiao to come for a visit.

GYZ: 椒者何？楚大夫也。楚無大夫，此何以書？始有大夫也。始有大夫，則何以不氏？許夷狄者不一而足也。

Who is Jiao? A noble officer from Chu. Chu has no ranks of noble officers,[37] so why is it here recorded? Because here it started to have ranks of noble officers. If it

---

[35] Huan 15.8 (Liu 2011: 93; *SSJZS* 5: 2221). The passage implies inferiority of the visiting leaders, who are not referred to according to their official titles. For the complexity in the use of the designation “men” 人 in the *Chunqiu* records, see Van Auken 2011.

[36] Xi 21.4 (Liu 2011: 241; *SSJZS* 11: 2256).

started here to have ranks of noble officers, then why is the surname [of the noble officer] not recorded? One occurrence is not enough to allow Yi-Di [to be treated like a Zhou polity].[38]

And, conversely, the Central States can change their status into "new Yi-Di":

CQ: 戊辰，吳敗頓、胡、沈、蔡、陳、許之師于雞父。

On the day *wuchen*, Wu defeated the armies of Dun, Hu, Shen, Cai, Chen, and Xu at Jifu.

GYZ: 此偏戰也，曷為以詐戰之辭言之？不與夷狄之主中國也。然則曷為不使中國主之？中國亦新夷狄也。

This was a positional war [as indicated through giving the date and place of the battle]. Why does it then talk about it in terms of a surprise attack [using the term "defeat" 敗 instead of the term "conducting war against" 戰]? It does not grant the Yi-Di [states such as Wu, which did not belong to the Central States] precedence over the Central States [such as Dun, Hu, Shen, Cai, Chen, and Xu]. Why then are

---

[37] Yuri Pines pointed out (in personal communication) that "the *Gongyang zhuan*'s insistence that Chu and Qin have no noble officers 大夫 is counterfactual (both *Zuo zhuan* and archeological data indicate the belonging of both states to the Zhou cultural sphere); it may reflect a late Warring States period process of cultural estrangement between the peripheral and the Central States, which caused Qin and Chu to be reimagined as cultural others."

[38] Wen 9.12 (Liu 2011: 303; *SSJZS* 13: 2270). Normally, a visiting noble had to be recorded with his surname.

not the Central States made the leaders? Because the Central States were also like new Yi-Di.[39]

We do see "barbarian" states accepted as partly belonging to the ritual realm of the Zhou and behaving like or even better than members of the Central States. Yet they are never fully admitted as equal members of the Central States in formal terms and are always somehow marked as belonging to the Yi-Di (*yidi zhi* 夷狄之) in the records.[40] The decisive criterion used to differentiate the Central States from the Yi-Di is the ritual code of the Zhou. Therefore, Confucius, according to the *Gongyang zhuan*, got into trouble with his recording

---

[39] Zhao 23.7 (Liu 2011: 554; *SSJZS* 24: 2327). The Central States are considered as new Yi-Di here because after the death of the Son of Heaven (King Jing 景 of Zhou) in the previous year (Zhao 22, 520 BCE), the *Chunqiu* reported turmoil in the royal house 王室亂, succession struggles resulting in the death of the royal successor, Prince Meng 猛, and an eclipse of the sun. In the twenty-third year, calamitous events continued to occur: Jin attacked a city in the royal domain to quell Prince Zhao's 朝 rebellion, but the rebellion continued, the incumbent king (King Jing 敬) was driven from the capital, Prince Zhao was set up in his place, and there was an earthquake. In the view of the *Gongyang zhuan*, the "barbarian" state of Wu 吳 (for the history and status of the state of Wu, see Wagner 1993: 96ff.) taking precedence over the Central States is justified because the Zhou ritual order was not preserved by anyone at that time. As none could justifiably claim to follow the ritual system of the Zhou, none could be made the legitimate leader in the ritual order of the historical records of the *Chunqiu*.

[40] The expression that they are marked as belonging to the Central States (*Zhongguo zhi* 中國之) does not occur, to my knowledge, until Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824 CE) uses it in his "Yuan Dao" 原道 ("Tracing the Way to Its Origins") when referring to the *Chunqiu*: "Producing the *Chunqiu*, Confucius presented the regional lords as belonging to the Yi when they employed the ritual code of the Yi, and when they moved close to the [ritual code of the] Central States he presented them as belonging to the Central States" 孔子之作春秋也，諸侯用夷禮則夷之，進於中國則中國之。 (*Han Changli* 1: 17).

when Yi-Di acted ritually more accurately than members of the Central States:

> *CQ*: 晉荀林父帥師及楚子戰于邲，晉師敗績。
>
> Xun Linfu from Jin led an army and fought with the Viscount of Chu at Bi. The army of Jin was utterly defeated.
>
> *GYZ*: 大夫不敵君，此其稱名氏以敵楚子何？不與晉而與楚子為禮也。
>
> A noble officer does not equal a ruler. Why is he here then called by his personal name and surname to equal the Viscount of Chu? Because it is not appropriate that it was not Jin but the Viscount of Chu who acted according to ritual.[41]

The distinction between interior and exterior realms follows the logic of the ritual system, which is basically a system of distinctions. Distinguishing between interior and exterior realms is an expansion of the aim to rigidly define ritual competences and authority also beyond the system itself. It determines not only the powers and limitations of social positions within the Zhou ritual system but also the borders of the system itself. Like the other ritual distinctions, this is conditional to keep the system intact and to avoid any interference with other (cultural) powers that could question it or claim dominance over it. The distinctions serve to define a fixed order. Nowhere does the *Gongyang zhuan* use the distinction between interior and exterior to stir or justify expansion. This is yet another point that differentiates it from Han texts.

[L1] The Ideology and Literary Form of the *Gongyang zhuan*

[L2] The Ideology of Ritual and Morality

---

[41] Xuan 12.3 (Liu 2011: 362; *SSJZS* 16: 2284–2285).

The ritual code—according to which the Viscount of Chu acted—refers to a set of rules allegedly created by King Wen. It is regarded as timelessly valid in providing guidelines for appropriate action. Catalogs of such ritual rules can be found in ritual chapters such as the "Quli" 曲禮 chapter of the *Liji* as well as in the abovementioned *Wangdu ji* and "Wang zhi" chapters.

The *Gongyang zhuan*'s ideology of ritual rules envisions a closed system of an ideal order that not only is grounded in the aim of exerting power but also reflects a philosophical, religious, or moral order. Yet there is a clear awareness in the *Gongyang zhuan* that the power of this ideology of ritual rules (that are restricted in number) lies in its applicability to a variety of real-life situations that vastly outnumber these rules. Taking the *Chunqiu* as a collection of representative precedent cases, the *Gongyang zhuan* is also aware that these are likewise limited in number and not sufficient to provide enough models to map the complexity of reality in a framework of casuistic deduction.[42] There are two possible ways to deal with this limitation of the given ritual rules with regard to the infinity of real-life situations. First, new ritual rules can be created as supplements to existing rules, either by analogy with the existing rules or on the basis of shared basic principles. This exegetical strategy is used, for example, in the commentaries to the *Yili* 儀禮 and in many *Liji* chapters that relate to earlier sets of ritual rules (such as those in the *Yili*).[43] This first strategy still operates within the assumptions of a closed and all-encompassing ritual system that can be expanded to include all kinds of new situations.

---

[42] The successful tradition of the *Yijing* 易經 proves that, in contrast, sixty-four situations are sufficient in the realm of divinatory deduction.

[43] For an analysis of the *Sangfu zhuan* 喪服傳 and *Liji* complements to the "Sangfu" 喪服 chapter of the *Yili*, see Gentz 2010.

The second strategy applies in situations where ritual rules conflict with one another. In these cases, the rules and the values behind these rules have to be weighed and evaluated according to morality. The recognition that this may be necessary concedes that the ritual system is imperfect. In order to operate properly and remain authoritative, the ritual system needs a further means of regulating affairs that is not linked to ritual rules. This further means of regulation is moral weighing (*quan* 權) (for which see also Vankeerberghen 2005–2006).

To maintain the authority and operability of the ritual ideology, morality is introduced as a methodological solution to the limitations of ritual. Morality is developed neither as a countermodel to replace ritual nor as an identical alternative that can be adopted in cases where applicable ritual rules are lacking. It is, rather, a fundamentally different way of realizing intuitions grounded in the human heart and enacted in virtuous acts of benevolence, righteousness, and other virtues. These are also formalized in rituals that, for systematic reasons (and not just the lack of casuistic rules), cannot always be applied.

Hence, to put it very briefly, the ideology of the ritual system envisions an ideal order that is based on authoritative rules and is valid beyond particular circumstantial situations. The power of morality, in contrast, is a function and an effect of this ideal order in the particularities of the real world. It is the result and effect of appropriate applications of the ideal order in situations in which the ritual rules fail to operate. Morality, therefore, ensures the continuous power of the prevailing ideology by, first, conceding that this ideology as represented in the system of ritual rules is imperfect and fails in certain situations and, second, offering an alternative way of dealing with these situations in the spirit of the existent ideology and thus offering an alternative way of enacting the power of this ideology.

These different facets of the ideology are also reflected in the literary form of the *Gongyang zhuan*, which in turn responds to the literary form of the *Chunqiu* as interpreted by the *Gongyang zhuan*.

[TL2] The Literary Form of the *Chunqiu*

In early Chinese texts, ideology and literary form are inseparable. There are many examples of early Chinese texts in which the literary form reflects the contents of the text (see Gentz and Meyer, forthcoming; Behr and Gentz 2005). The interlocking parallels in the *Laozi* 老子 (Wagner 2000: 53–113) reflect the interrelationship of, for example, being and nonbeing, named and unnamed, shaped and unshaped; the use of metaphor in dialogues in the *Mengzi* expresses the belief in the potential of human intuition to grasp basic shared values and virtues; the strict argumentative essayistic constructions in parts of some *Xunzi* chapters[44] and in the *Han Feizi* 韓非子 are demonstrations of meticulously constructed artifacts that are considered intellectual tools, superior to human intuition, for the betterment of human beings.

The *Gongyang zhuan* is no exception in this respect. It is, in fact, the earliest text that explicitly interprets the literary form of a text (the *Chunqiu*) as an expression of its ideology and develops a corresponding methodology of interpretation. Furthermore, it creates its own literary form accordingly. The *Gongyang zhuan* identifies three different formal modes of expression in the *Chunqiu*:

1. Regular records. These records are written according to a fixed pattern of historiographical rules that delineate specific types of records and every detail of the record, including standardized forms of elements such as dating, place-names, or titles for each specific type of record, clearly defined sequential orders of certain elements of a record,

[44] See the analysis of chapter 1 of the *Xunzi* by Kern (forthcoming-b) and of chapter 23 by Gentz (forthcoming).

appropriate terminology for titles and technical terms, and the like.[45] Such records indicate regular historical events, and the *Gongyang zhuan* does not comment upon them.

CQ: 夏，四月，丁未，公及鄭伯盟于越。

Summer, fourth month, day *dingwei*, the duke [of Lu] made a covenant with the Earl of Zheng in Yue.[46]

2. Deviating records. These records display formal deviations from the historiographical standard and indicate irregular (exceedingly good or bad) historical events. The formal deviations are not mistakes but meaningful expressions, and they call for an interpretation. Formally, the deviations can be either additional elements that do not belong in the type of record in which they occur or different terms (titles, technical terms), different sequential orders, absent elements that normally would be part of a certain type of record, or records of topoi that are normally not recorded.[47] The *Gongyang zhuan* often explicitly formulates rules for such deviations, as in Wen 9.3:

CQ: 二月，辛丑，葬襄王。

Second month, day *xinchou*, burial of King Xiang.

GYZ: 王者不書葬，此何以書？不及時書，過時書，我有往者則書。

---

[45] For a study of these patterns in the *Chunqiu*, see Gentz 2001: appendix; Duan Xizhong 2002: 151–405; Van Auken 2007.

[46] Huan 1.3 (Liu 2011: 53; *SSJZS* 4: 2213).

[47] See Duan Xizhong 2002: 151–223. Van Auken (2007) gives a description of these records, which she calls “marked.”

Burials of kings are normally not recorded; why is it recorded here? They are recorded when they are carried out too early, when they are carried out too late, or when our [i.e., Lu] representative participates.[48]

3. Absent records. This third mode is the absence of a record that, according to the historiographical pattern, is expected to appear. The reason for this absence and its significance must be explained, as in Yin 11.4:

CQ: 冬，十有一月，壬辰，公薨。

Winter, eleventh month, day *renchen*, the duke [of Lu] deceased.

GYZ: 何以不書葬？隱之也。何隱爾？弒也。弒則何以不書葬？春秋君弒，賊不討，不書葬 ，以為無臣子也。子沈子曰：「君弒，臣不討賊，非臣也。不復讎，非子也。葬，生者之事也。春秋君弒，賊不討，不書葬，以為不繫乎臣子也。」

Why is the burial not recorded? To conceal it. Why was it concealed? He was assassinated. Since he was assassinated, why is the burial then not recorded? In the *Chunqiu*, when a ruler is assassinated and the murder is not punished, then the burial is not recorded. That the burial is not recorded is because it takes this as an indication that there are no ministers and sons. Zi Shenzi said: When a ruler is assassinated and the minister does not punish the murder, then he is not a minister. If [the son] does not take revenge, he is not a son. The burial is a matter of the living. In the *Chunqiu*,

[48] Liu 2011: 302; *SSJZS* 13: 2269.

> when a ruler is assassinated and the murder is not punished, it does not record the burial because it cannot connect it to ministers or sons.[49]

The *Gongyang zhuan* marks these records by using the formulaic question "Why did the *Chunqiu* not write *x*?" (*heyi bu shu* 何以不書 *x*?).

[L2] The Literary Form of the *Gongyang zhuan*

In keeping with this threefold model of expression, the *Gongyang zhuan* also conveys its own messages in a threefold way. The ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan* therefore has to be reconstructed from these three modes of expression, which take the following forms:

1. Ritual rules that the *Gongyang zhuan* cites in order to prove deviation from the ritual code in the *Chunqiu*. These rules are an expression of the ritual system of King Wen (or, more precisely, "methods and measures of King Wen" 文王之法度), which is taken as an authoritative guideline for proper action and sociopolitical order and can thus be regarded as the normative basis of the *Gongyang zhuan*'s ideology.

2. Historical narratives transmitted by the *Gongyang zhuan* in order to explain the background of certain records. As this background explains Confucius's judgments inserted in these records, the narratives operate as empirical evidence of Confucius's normative judgments. They also explain judgments of situations for which no matching ritual rule can be found or created.

3. The absence either of a commentary on *Chunqiu* records that are obviously irregular or of particular terms and concepts in the commentary that are normatively expected to be employed in any contemporary discussion of certain topics.

---

[49] Liu 2011: 50; *SSJZS* 3: 2210.

The use of these three modes of expression is not haphazard but is carefully employed to convey different meanings that, beyond the overt messages of the records, lie solely in their form. In the following I will first analyze the forms one by one as literary modes displaying ideological contents. I will then discuss how the particular combination of different forms and ideologies enables the *Gongyang zhuan* to give expression to a further dimension of meaning through the integration of different aspects into a more complex whole, like the depth perception afforded by binocular vision or stereophonic sound by binaural hearing.

[L3]Ritual Rules

The ritual rules in the *Gongyang zhuan* refer to a series of concrete prescriptions that regulate the entire spectrum of a noble person's activities—from titles to garments to proper positioning—according to his rank within the Zhou aristocratic hierarchy. These are the basic means of upholding the sociopolitical hierarchy headed by the king. The *Gongyang zhuan* quotes these to define the norms of the Zhou ritual system (against which deviations from these norms can be made obvious). Some examples will illustrate the different kinds of ritual rules propounded by the *Gongzang zhuan*.[50]

CQ: 三月，庚戌，天王崩。

Third month, *gengxu* day, the Heavenly King passed away.

GYZ: 何以不書葬？天子記崩不記葬，必其時也。諸侯記卒記葬，有天子存，不得必其時也。曷為或言崩或言薨？天子曰崩，諸侯曰薨，大夫曰卒，士曰不祿。

[50] For a full list of all *Gongyang* ritual rules classified according to themes and annotated with all parallels in the transmitted early Chinese literature, see Gentz 2001: 575–595.

Why is his burial not recorded? In the case of a Son of Heaven, his passing away is recorded but not his burial because this always takes place at a certain time [seven months after his death]. In the case of regional lords, the death as well as the burial is recorded because under the rule of a Son of Heaven, their burial does not necessarily take place at a certain time. Why does it sometimes say "passed away" and sometimes "deceased"? In the case of a Son of Heaven, to die is called "to pass away"; in the case of regional lords, it is called "to be deceased"; in the case of noble officers, it is called "to die"; in the case of *shi*-officers, it is called "ceasing to receive a salary."[51]

This passage, which is paralleled in the *Liji* and other early texts,[52] explicates the proper burial times and mortuary terminology applicable to each grade in the aristocratic hierarchy. Elsewhere other sumptuary laws are explained:

CQ: 初獻六羽。

The six [lines] feather [dance] was performed for the first time.

GYZ: 初者何？始也。六羽者何？舞也。初獻六羽何以書？譏。何譏爾？譏始僭諸公也。六羽之為僭奈何？天子八佾，諸公六，諸侯四。諸公者何？諸侯者何？天子三公稱公，王者之後稱公，其餘大國稱侯，小國稱伯、子、男。天子三公者何？天子之相也。天子之相則何以三？自陝而東者，周公主之，自陝而

[51] Yin 3.2 (Liu 2011: 19; *SSJZS* 2: 2203).

[52] "Wang zhi," "Li qi" 禮器, "Zaji xia" 雜記下, and "Quli xia" chapters of the *Liji*; "Si dai" 四代 chapter of the *Da Dai Liji*; *Erya*, "Shi gu" 釋詁; *Zuo zhuan*; *Yuejue shu* 越絕書; *Shuoyuan* 說苑, etc.; Gentz 2001: 590.

西者召公主之，一相處乎內。始僭諸公昉於此乎？前此矣。前此則曷為始乎？此僭諸公猶可言也，僭天子不可言也。

What is the "first time"? It is the beginning. What is "six feathers"? It is a dance. Why is it recorded that the six [lines] feather [dance] was performed for the first time? To criticize. What was criticized? The beginning of the usurpation of [a ritual pertaining to the] dukes.[53] In what respect is the six [lines] feather [dance] a usurpation? The Son of Heaven has eight lines [of eight dancers], the dukes have six, the marquises have four. Who are dukes and who are marquises? The Three Dukes of the Son of Heaven are called dukes, and the descendants of the kings [of the preceding dynasties Xia and Shang, the rulers of the states Qi 杞 and Song 宋] are called dukes. The [rulers of] the rest of the great states are called marquises; those of the small states are called earls, viscounts, and barons. Who are the Three Dukes of the Son of Heaven? They are the Son of Heaven's [highest] ministers.[54] Why are the Son of Heaven's highest ministers three in number? [During the perfect rule of the early Zhou kings, which set the standards for all later times,] the territory east of Shan was controlled by the Duke of Zhou, the territory west of Shan was controlled by the Duke of Shao, and one high minister attended inside [at the royal court]. Did the beginning of the usurpation of the dukes' [ritual prerogatives] start with this [six lines feather dance]? [It started] before this. If [it started] before this, why is it then [presented as] the beginning? This usurpation of the dukes' [ritual prerogatives] can

[53] See *Lunyu* 3.1 for the same critique. *Zuo zhuan* gives different rules.

[54] For the Grand Tutor 太師, Grand Assistant 太傅, and Grand Protector 太保 as defined in the "Zhouguan" 周官 ("The Officers of Zhou") chapter of the *Shangshu* 尚書, see Legge 1976: 527.

still be mentioned; the usurpation of the Son of Heaven's [ritual prerogatives] cannot.[55]

Another important category of ritual rules relates to sacrificial procedures:

CQ: 夏，四月，四卜郊不從，乃免牲，猶三望。

Summer, fourth month, four divinations regarding the great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven were not auspicious. Thereupon the sacrificial ox was released. The threefold "gazing afar" [sacrifice to Mount Tai, Yellow River, and Eastern Sea] was still carried out.

GYZ: 曷為或言三卜？或言四卜？三卜，禮也；四卜，非禮也。三卜何以禮？四卜何以非禮？求吉之道三。禘嘗不卜，郊何以卜？卜郊，非禮也。卜郊何以非禮？魯郊，非禮也。魯郊何以非禮？天子祭天，諸侯祭土。天子有方望之事無所不通。諸侯山川有不在其封內者，則不祭也。曷為或言免牲？或言免牛？免牲，禮也；免牛，非禮也。免牛何以非禮？傷者曰牛。三望者何？望祭也。然則曷祭？祭泰山河海？曷為祭泰山河海？山川有能潤于百里者，天子秩而祭之。觸石而出，膚寸而合，不崇朝而徧雨乎天下者，唯泰山爾。河海潤于千里。猶者何？通可以已也。何以書？譏不郊而望祭也。

Why is there sometimes talk of three divinations and sometimes talk of four divinations?[56] Three divinations are in accord with ritual. Four divinations are not in

[55] Yin 5.5 (Liu 2011: 33–34; *SSJZS* 3: 2207). The last lines imply that territorial lords were responsible for their eventual loss of ritual superiority vis-à-vis their ministers: they were the first to usurp ritual prerogatives of the Sons of Heaven.

accord with ritual. Why are three divinations in accord with ritual and four divinations not in accord with ritual? The correct method of seeking auspicious signs is threefold [divination]. There is no divination for the [auspiciousness of the] summer *di* sacrifice and the autumn *chang* sacrifice. Why is there divination for the great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven? To divine for the great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven is not in accord with ritual. Why is it not in accord with ritual to divine for the great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven? That the state of Lu conducts the great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven is not in accord with ritual. Why is Lu's conducting the great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven not in accord with ritual? The Son of Heaven sacrifices to Heaven and the regional lords sacrifice to Earth. In "gazing afar" sacrificial offerings [to the universal terrestrial powers Mount Tai, Yellow River, and Eastern Sea], the Son of Heaven pervades everywhere. [In their "gazing afar" sacrifices to their local] mountains and rivers, regional lords do not sacrifice to what does not lie within their fiefdom. Why is there sometimes talk of "releasing the *sacrificial ox*"[57] and sometimes of "releasing the *ox*"?[58] "Releasing the *sacrificial ox*" is in accord with ritual; "releasing the *ox*" is not in accord with ritual. Why is "releasing the *ox*" not in accord with ritual? If it is harmed, it is called "*ox*."[59] What is meant by "threefold gazing afar"? It is a "gazing afar" sacrifice. So to whom is a sacrifice made? A sacrifice is made to Mount Tai, [Yellow] River, and [Eastern] Sea. Why is a sacrifice made to Mount Tai,

---

[56] Compare Xiang 7.2 (Liu 2011: 447; *SSJZS* 19: 2302), with three divinations, and Xiang 11.2 (Liu 2011: 456; *SSJZS* 19: 2304), with four. In Cheng 10.2 (Liu 2011: 407; *SSJZS* 17: 2293–2294) even five divinations are recorded.

[57] See Xiang 7.2 (Liu 2011: 447; *SSJZS* 19: 2302).

[58] See Cheng 7.1 (Liu 2011: 398; *SSJZS* 17: 2292).

[59] In Cheng 7.1, for example, a mouse had repeatedly gnawed at the sacrificial oxen's horns so that they had to be released.

[Yellow] River, and [Eastern] Sea? To those mountains and rivers that can give water to an area of up to one hundred *li* the Son of Heaven makes sacrifices according to their range. When [the moisture] touches upon stones, it exits [as condensation] and amalgamates as slight vapor. However, that it brings rain all over the world even before the next morning, this is only at Mount Tai. And the [Yellow] River and [Eastern] Sea give water to areas of up to one thousand *li*. [Therefore, the Son of Heaven makes special sacrifices to these three.] What does "still" mean [in the last sentence]? It means that [the sacrifices] should have been canceled throughout. Why was it recorded? To criticize that there was a "gazing afar" sacrifice when there was no great *jiao* sacrifice to Heaven.[60]

In contrast to most sumptuary laws, most rules pertaining to sacrificial details have very few parallels in the early literature (apart from *Zuo zhuan* and *Guliang zhuan*). Only those sacrificial rules that emphasize the strong distinctions between the sacrificial rights of the Son of Heaven and those of the regional lords and that buttress hierarchical relations between them can be found in other early texts.[61] These relations are also emphasized in other rules:

CQ: 九月，齊侯送姜氏于讙。

Ninth month, the Marquis of Qi escorted Miss Jiang as a bride to the city of Huan [in the state of Lu].

GYZ: 何以書？譏。何譏爾？諸侯越竟送女，非禮也。

---

[60] Xi 31.3 (Liu 2011: 270; *SSJZS* 12: 2263).

[61] The "Wang zhi," "Li yun" 禮運, and "Quli xia" chapters of the *Liji* were also echoed in *Shuoyuan* and other texts (see Gentz 2001: 593).

Why was this recorded? To criticize. What is criticized? That regional lords cross the border to escort brides is not according to ritual.[62]

CQ: 莒慶來逆叔姬。

Qing from Ju came to meet his bride Shu Ji.

GYZ: 莒慶者何？莒大夫也。莒無大夫，此何以書？譏。何譏爾？大夫越竟逆女，非禮也。

Who is Qing from Ju? He was a noble officer from Ju. Ju has no noble officers, so why is this recorded [in a manner as if he would be a noble officer: by recording his name]? To criticize. What is criticized? That noble officers cross the border to meet their brides is not according to ritual.[63]

The whole system of ritual rules reflected in these translated passages aims at strengthening the authority of the ruler, particularly through a set of very concrete legal and ritual definitions. These rules aim to perpetuate an imagined ideal Zhou order and demand subordination of the interests of aristocratic lineages (*jiashi* 家事) to the state authority

---

[62] Huan 3.6 (Liu 2011: 62; *SSJZS* 4: 2214–2215).

[63] Zhuang 27.5 (Liu 2011: 165; *SSJZS* 8: 2239). Ju was a non-Xia 夏 polity, hence the *Gongyang*'s assertion that Ju had no noble officers (in the ideal ritual reality of the *Gongyang zhuan*). Yet the *Gongyang zhuan* seems to accept the historical reality of noble officers in Ju by claiming that what the record criticizes is that *noble officers* crossed the border to meet their brides. The reader thus does not know whether Ju's ritual claim to have noble officers is criticized in the first place or whether it is the fact that noble officers crossed the border to meet their brides. The critique is probably directed against someone claiming (against the Zhou ritual order) to be a noble officer and then (transgressing the Zhou ritual propriety of his own claim) crossing the border to meet his bride.

(*wangshi* 王事). The central passage in the *Gongyang zhuan* that discusses this relationship runs as follows:

CQ: 三年春，齊國夏、衛石曼姑帥師圍戚。

Third year, spring, Guo Xia from Qi 齊 and Shi Mangu from Wei led an army and surrounded [the city of] Qi 戚.

GYZ: 齊國夏曷為與衛石曼姑帥師圍戚？伯討也。此其為伯討奈何？曼姑受命乎靈公而立輒，以曼姑之義，為固可以距之也。輒者曷為者也？蒯聵之子也。然則曷為不立蒯聵而立輒？蒯聵為無道，靈公逐蒯聵而立輒。然則輒之義可以立乎？曰：可。其可奈何？不以父命辭王父命，以王父命辭父命，是父之行乎子也；不以家事辭王事，以王事辭家事，是上之行乎下也。

Why did Guo Xia from Qi together with Shi Mangu from Wei lead an army and surround the city of Qi? This was a case of a [justified] punishment by the hegemon. In which regard was this a case of a [justified] punishment by the hegemon? Mangu received an order from Lord Ling [of Wei] and thereupon established Zhe [as the ruler of Wei]. Based on Mangu's righteous position [in this affair], it was clearly permissible to repel [Zhe's father, Kuaikui, in the city of Qi]. Who was this Zhe? Zhe was the son of Kuaikui. Then why was Kuaikui not established rather than Zhe? Kuaikui acted without moral principles. Lord Ling therefore expelled Kuaikui and established Zhe. But was Zhe's [position] sufficiently righteous to allow his establishment? The answer is: it was. How could this be? A son's proper action toward his fatherly line should be like that: do not reject the grandfather's order for the sake of the father's order; do reject the father's order for the sake of the grandfather's order. The inferior's proper action toward his superiors should be like

that: do not reject royal affairs for the sake of family affairs; do reject family affairs for the sake of royal affairs.[64]

The potential contradiction between family and political obligations was one of the touchiest issues for the followers of Confucius, including the Master himself. The *Gongyang zhuan*'s assertion that the ruler's authority should be prioritized over that of the father places this text squarely at the extreme ruler-focused edge of Confucian thought.[65]

The *Gongyang zhuan* asserts its ritual system with reference to three different kinds of authorities: a number of authoritative personalities in the past,[66] the human heart (*xin* 心),[67] and righteousness (*yi* 義). The latter two (*xin* and *yi*) both appear in the commentary to Wen 9.1, which is exceptional in many respects:

CQ: 九年春，毛伯來求金。

---

[64] Ai 3.1 (Liu 2011: 625–626; *SSJZS* 27: 2346).

[65] Both the *Lunyu* (13.18: 139) and *Mengzi* (13.35: 317) stipulate the priority of family ties over political obligations. Similar views are expressed in even more radical ways in some of the Guodian documents, such as *Liu de* 六德, which stipulates priority of mourning (and, mutatis mutandis, social) obligations to the father over those due to the ruler. See Pines 2009: 240n7, q.v. for further references.

[66] These authorities are, most importantly, King Wen, who is regarded as the creator of the ritual system; the first hegemon, Lord Huan of Qi 齊桓公 (r. 686–643), who is said, in Xi 3.5 (Liu 2011: 200; *SSJZS* 10: 2248), to have formulated a number of important rules; the six historiographers who established rules of recording and are mentioned in n. 14 above, plus a seventh, Zi Gongyangzi 子公羊子); the ways of old; and Confucius.

[67] The heart refers to something like the moral sense of filial sons, of upright ministers, or of the people in general.

Ninth year, spring, the Earl of Mao came [to Lu] to ask for [a contribution of] metal [for the king's burial].

GYZ: 毛伯者何？天子之大夫也。何以不稱使？當喪未君也。逾年矣，何以謂之未君？即位矣，而未稱王也。未稱王，何以知其即位？以諸侯之逾年即位，亦知天子之逾年即位也。以天子三年然後稱王，亦知諸侯於其封內三年稱子也。逾年稱公矣，則曷為於其封內三年稱子？緣民臣之心，不可一日無君；緣終始之義，一年不二君，不可曠年無君；緣孝子之心，則三年不忍當也。毛伯來求金，何以書？譏。何譏爾？王者無求，求金非禮也。然則是王者與？曰：非也。非王者則曷為謂之王者，「王者無求」？曰：是子也。繼文王之體，守文王之法度，文王之法無求而求，故譏之也。

Who is the Earl of Mao? He is a noble officer of the Son of Heaven. Why does it then not say that he was "dispatched" [by the Son of Heaven]? During the mourning period there was not yet an [officially enthroned] ruler. The new calendric year had already started, so how could one say that there was not yet an [officially enthroned] ruler? [The Zhou ruler] had already been enthroned but was not yet titled "king." If he was not yet titled "king," how does one know that he had been enthroned? From the fact that regional lords are enthroned after the beginning of a new calendric year, one also knows that the Son of Heaven is enthroned after the beginning of a new calendric year. From the fact that the Son of Heaven is titled "king" only after three years [of mourning], one also knows that regional lords within their fiefs are titled "son" during the three years [of mourning].[68] If after the start of the new calendric

[68] The *Zuo zhuan* confirms this rule in Xi 9.1 in one of its so-called *fan* rules: "It is a general rule that while they are mourning, kings are called 'little child' and regional lords are called 'son'" 凡在丧，王曰小童，公侯曰子.

> year they are titled "duke," why are they then within their regions titled "son" during the three years [of mourning]? In compliance with the heart of the people and officials, it is impossible to have one day without a ruler; in accord with the righteousness of calendric beginning and end, there are not two rulers within one calendric year, yet it is also impossible to have a whole calendric year without a ruler. In compliance with the heart of a filial son, he cannot bear to take his official position for three years [after the death of one of his parents]. Why is it recorded that the Earl of Mao came to ask for metal? To criticize. What is criticized? A true king does not ask for anything; to ask for metal is not according to the ritual rules. But then was there actually a king? The answer is: there was not. If there was no king, then why was there reference to a king when stating that "a true king does not ask for anything"? The answer is: he was in fact only a "son." Yet he continues the [institutional] body of King Wen and observes the regulations and measures of King Wen. According to the regulations of King Wen, he must not ask for anything, yet he asked for something. Therefore, he is criticized.[69]

This commentary illustrates how difficult the interplay of different authoritative instances could be in a concrete case. The ritual rules display the imagined ideal order of the political ideology of the Zhou, which should follow both the heart (of the people, officials, and filial sons) and the righteousness of beginning and end (of the calendric year). The ideal patterns of the historiographical text (*wen* 文) normally follow the formal principle of calendric beginning and end. Yet the historical reality (*shi* 實) recorded at the same time as an important matter of the heart that does not match the formal principle of calendric beginning and end requires some compromise in the form of the record. This conflict is solved mainly

[69] Liu 2011: 301; *SSJZS* 13: 2269.

through the insertion of historical narratives by which the formal deviations in the record can be explained as appropriate formal expressions that satisfy the incompatible requirements of both the heart and righteousness.

[L3]Historical Narratives

Looking at the second form of literary expression, we see that these narrative passages do not define ideal rules but serve to explain the more complex and problematic cases of rule application in reality (*shi* 實, as opposed to the ideal, rule-based pattern of the text, *wen* 文).[70] The historical stories in the *Gongyang zhuan* display an additional focus on situations where the ideology of the fixed, defined ritual rules does not easily apply to the historical reality. This ideology does not permit the representation of the complex reality of these empirical cases in the ideal patterns of the historiographical records.[71] The situations in these cases are complex and ambivalent, and most importantly, they are often situations that are defined as "no [true] Son of Heaven above and no regional hegemon below" 上無天子。下無方伯, which indicates that the overall political context is out of order and therefore requires compromises.[72] It is therefore impossible to make a general, rule-based decision regarding which action is appropriate in the given specific context. Instead of giving new rules for such situations outside the ritual framework, the narrative passages emphasize the ability to weigh

---

[70] Xi 1.2 (Liu 2011: 188; *SSJZS* 10: 2246), Xi 2.1 (Liu 2011: 194–195; *SSJZS* 10: 2247), Xi 14.1 (Liu 2011: 225; *SSJZS* 11: 2253), Wen 14.6 (Liu 2011: 318; *SSJZS* 14: 2273), Xuan 11.5 (Liu 2011: 360; *SSJZS* 16: 2284), and Ding 1.2 (Liu 2011: 580; *SSJZS* 25: 2334).

[71] The *Gongyang zhuan* uses the formulation "it is granted in reality but not in the patterned text [of the historical records]" 實與而文不與 several times to make this argument.

[72] Zhuang 4.4 (Liu 2011: 112; *SSJZS* 6: 2226), Xi 1.2 (Liu 2011: 188; *SSJZS* 10: 2246), Xi 2.1 (Liu 2011: 194–195; *SSJZS* 10: 2247), Xi 14.1 (Liu 2011: 225; *SSJZS* 11: 2253), Xuan 11.5 (Liu 2011: 360; *SSJZS* 16: 2284).

one's behavior according to the circumstances (*quan* 權) in order to make it expedient and powerful (Goldin 2005b: 19–21; Vankeerberghen 2005–2006). Guiding principles such as indulgence, pity, and humanity are provided for orientation. There are never any references in these stories to ritual rules or historical authorities apart from King Wen and Confucius. Instead, we find a number of general moral guidelines put into the mouths of historical actors who conduct the dialogues in the stories (Queen 2013b).

One central passage in the *Gongyang zhuan* in particular discusses the concept of weighing (*quan* 權) as follows:

> *CQ*: 九月，宋人執鄭祭仲。
>
> Ninth month. Men from Song seized Zhai Zhong from Zheng.
>
> *GYZ*: 祭仲者何？鄭相也。何以不名？賢也。何賢乎祭仲？以為知權也。其為知權奈何？古者鄭國處于留。先鄭伯有善于鄓公者，通乎夫人，以取其國，而遷鄭焉，而野留。莊公死已葬，祭仲將往省于留，塗出于宋，宋人執之。謂之曰：「為我出忽而立突。」祭仲不從其言，則君必死、國必亡；從其言，則君可以生易死，國可以存易亡。少遼緩之，則突可故出，而忽可故反，是不可得則病，然後有鄭國。古人之有權者，祭仲之權是也。權者何？權者反於經，然後有善者也。權之所設，舍死亡無所設。行權有道，自貶損以行權，不害人以行權。殺人以自生，亡人以自存，君子不為也。
>
> Who is Zhai Zhong? He is a minister from Zheng. Why is his name not given?[73] To present him as worthy. What [did the *Chunqiu* consider] worthy about Zhai Zhong?

[73] Zhong was Zhai's appellation that indicated his sequence of birth (行辭), meaning "the second brother." His personal name (名) was Zu 足.

It considered him to know how to weigh [matters according to circumstance]. In what regard did he know how to weigh [matters according to circumstance]? In ancient times, the capital of the state of Zheng was located at Liu. Among the earlier rulers of Zheng there was one [Lord Wu 鄭武公, r. 770–744] who was on good terms with the Lord of Kuai. He had illicit relations with the Lord of Kuai's wife, thereupon seized Kuai's capital, and moved Zheng's capital there, thus making Liu a peripheral town. After the death of Lord Zhuang of Zheng [r. 743–701], and when his burial was over, Zhai Zhong planned to go to Liu to carry out investigations. He passed through Song and the men of Song captured him and said to him: "For our sake expel [Zheng's heir apparent] Hu and establish [the son of a concubine from Song] Tu [as successor of the deceased Lord Zhuang of Zheng]." Zhai Zhong [was aware that] if he did not accede to this demand, then the [new] ruler would inevitably be killed and the state would inevitably be extinguished. If he acceded to this demand, then the ruler could exchange death for life and the state could exchange extinction for existence. After a little while they could then be interchanged: Tu could for some reason be expelled and Hu could for some reason return. If this could not be achieved, then this would be vicious. But after all there would still be the state of Zheng. Among the weighing [of matters] of the people of old, Zhai Zhong's weighing is a valid one. What is weighing [of matters according to circumstances]? Weighing is when one turns against the ruling norms and achieves something good afterward. As to the implementation of weighing, unless death [of people] and extinction [of states] are at stake it must never be implemented. Exercising weighing follows [two] basic principles: oneself might suffer derogation by exercising weighing, but no harm might be done to anyone else. To kill others for the sake of

one's own life, to extinguish others [states] for the sake of one's own existence, this is something noble persons do not do.[74]

In this commentary, the *Gongyang zhuan* provides a clear definition of weighing and further defines conditions in which weighing is appropriate. Accordingly, violating the ruling norms by weighing to achieve something good should be implemented only in situations of existential adversity and then only if it does not harm others.

The two different types of content (ideal, patterned, model, standard situations vs. real-life, complicated and deviating situations) in the *Gongyang zhuan* basically adhere to the same ideology of strengthening the ruler's power, but they emphasize different points. The ritual rules provide a fixed set of moral and ritual values that can be applied to most of the historical situations recorded in the *Chunqiu*. These rules belong to what the *Gongyang zhuan* terms *jing* 經 (in contrast to *quan* 權)[75] or *wen* 文 (as opposed to *shi* 實)[76] and reflect the ideal regular order.

---

[74] Huan 11.4 (Liu 2011: 81; *SSJZS* 5: 2219–2220).

[75] See Huan 11.2 above.

[76] Similar distinctions between the *normative* (*zheng* 正) and the *extraordinary* (*qi* 奇) are also made in military texts (Lewis 1990: 122–127) and also in ritual texts such as the *Liji*, where the "Liqi" 禮器 chapter distinguishes normative rites (*jingli* 經禮) from specific rites (*quli* 曲禮) for extraordinary circumstances ("Hence, there are three hundred normative rites and three thousand specific rites, but their bottom line is the same" 故經禮三百，曲禮三千，其致一也; *Liji* XXIV.10: 651). The *Chunqiu fanlu* uses the terms *jingli* 經禮 and *bianli* 變禮 (variable rites) to analyze this difference, e.g.: "The *Chunqiu* has normative rites and variable rites. … He who clearly grasps the matter of normative versus variable will then understand the divisions between the important and the minor: with him one can approach [the matter of] weighing according to the circumstances"《春秋》有經禮 , 有變禮 … 明乎經變之事 , 然後知輕重之分 , 可與適權矣 (*Chunqiu fanlu* III.4: 74 ["Yuying" 玉英]).

The narrative passages dealing with "weighing," however, are set up to describe real situations that are either so ambivalent and complex or so far out of the orthodox ritual reference frame that it is not possible to apply ideal rules to them. Instead, they show how such situations have to be dealt with, how the specific circumstances have to be weighed up, and how a morally correct decision about one's action can be achieved in irregular contexts in order to accord with the ideal to which the ritual rules apply. The narrative passages thus aim at the same ideal and supplement the ritual rules that apply only to common and normal situations.[77]

These two modes of ritual rules and historical narratives correspond to the two modes of presenting historical events—a patterned form of annalistic records and its deviations—that the *Gongyang zhuan* claims for the *Chunqiu*. The ritual rules apply to what we might call the regular form of situations; the narrative passages cover situations that deviate from this regularity. This point is important, because this distinction shows that the *Gongyang zhuan* recognizes the occurrence of situations that cannot be classified within the defined rules and therefore cannot be dealt with by means of these rules. The belief that every action could be regulated and controlled by an all-embracing set of casuistic ritual rules (that do not provide general guidelines but regulate singular cases one by one) is abandoned. There is no perfect ritual system of the Zhou, especially in times when "there is no [true] Son of Heaven above and no regional hegemon below" 上無天子，下無方伯.[78] The *Gongyang zhuan* attempts to establish a more flexible system that also allows different situations to be judged according to specific circumstances on the basis of general moral guiding principles. The *Gongyang zhuan*

[77] Queen (2013b) makes a similar observation in her analysis of *Gongyang* narratives when she writes: "They [i.e., the narratives] appear when the predominant praise and blame mode of explication tied exclusively to the wording of a given entry cannot fully disclose the ethical nuances of the judgment at hand."

[78] See n. 72.

might thus be taken as a counterproject to the vision of a rigid ritual system, as an attempt to revive and to actualize the ideal of Zhou ritual in a new historical setting, thereby reempowering the traditional ideology of the Zhou. Although the concern to stabilize the old aristocratic hierarchy and its values by defining exactly the frame of power and the duties of each position and of their mutual relations is a conservative one, the methodology of the *Gongyang zhuan* is innovative. The new flexibility of this style of judgment of right and wrong in the *Gongyang zhuan* was of central interest to Han readers in the juridical sphere as well.

[L3]Meaningful Absences

Unlike the first two modes of ideological expressions in the *Gongyang zhuan*, the third mode is not a method of expressing ideology but a method of exclusion that clearly demarcates the border between concepts and notions that are acceptable within the ideological discourse and those that are not. This method operates like a taboo, disallowing the existence of ideas that undermine the ideological discourse. This method of exclusion is one of the well-known ways of exerting power by means of discourse (Foucault 1981b). Assuming that the *Gongyang zhuan* in its own text applied the same methodology that it reads in the *Chunqiu* text,[79] we have to apply the question *heyi bu shu* 何以不書 . . .? (Why did the *Chunqiu* not record . . .?) also to the *Gongyang zhuan* and interpret absences accordingly. Yet these exclusions in turn allow us to understand much more clearly what is included in the ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan* and to identify the countertext against which it is set. I will briefly list the seven most important notions that are conspicuously and significantly absent in the *Gongyang zhuan*.

[79] For this technique in the Jewish tradition, see Strauss 1952.

1. Since ritual (*li* 禮) is such an important concept in the *Gongyang zhuan*, we are prompted to ask which concept of ritual is employed in the text. It appears as a very plain concept, without any elaboration or theory of ritual. Ritual is not connected to emotions (*qing* 情) or to the structure of heaven and earth. There is no doubt or questioning of ritual, nor any critical reasoning about it, as in, for example, the *Zuo zhuan*, the *Xunzi*, and many *Liji* chapters (Pines 2000b). Central terms of Warring States ritual theory like emotions (*qing*), intention (*zhi* 志), and reverence (*jing* 敬) are absent in the *Gongyang zhuan*.

2. The word "virtue" (*de* 德) is absent in the *Gongyang zhuan*.[80] This is striking since it appears in nearly every early Confucian text.

3. The terms "loyalty" (*zhong* 忠) and "filial piety" (*xiao* 孝) are missing, too. *Xiao* is found only once as part of the compound *xiao zi* (filial son).

4. The very common topos of the necessity of "selecting worthy ministers" (*qiu xian* 求賢) is absent as well.

5. The whole sphere of techniques (*shu* 術 or *shu* 數) (e.g., *yin-yang* 陰陽, *qi* 氣, self-cultivation, and Huang-Lao 黃老), the sphere of military theory (*bingfa* 兵法), and all administrative and legalist terminology are absent in the *Gongyang zhuan*, nor is there any criticism of these concepts. The topoi of penalties (*xing* 刑) and punishments (*fa* 罰) or rewards (*shang* 賞) are absent. The term *fa* 法 appears in only two passages in the *Gongyang zhuan*: once in the context of applying penal law[81] and once in the formulation "King Wen's

[80] The character *de* 得 is not used as a substitute for *de* 德.

[81] Cheng 2.4 (Liu 2011: 383; *SSJZS* 17: 2290): "How should they be treated according to penal law?" 其法奈何？

regulations and measures" (*Wen wang zhi fadu* 文王之法度), which designates the system of *ritual* rules as discussed above.[82]

6. Any consideration about the people (using the concept of *min* 民) is absent. Certainly, the *Chunqiu* also makes no mention of anyone below the level of noble officers (*dafu* 大夫). But we might expect positive judgments of persons who are in touch with, and friendly to, the people and critiques regarding poverty or a lack of welfare, as we find in the *Guliang zhuan*.[83]

7. Finally, the *Gongyang zhuan* doesn't talk about Heaven. It accepts records of calamities and anomalies (*zaiyi* 災異) as regular historiographical categories in the *Chunqiu*. However, it tries not to further elaborate on these Heavenly signs but keeps silent about these matters. Among the approximately 140 entries concerning calamities or anomalies, only two are related to a cause by the *Gongyang zhuan*.[84] In both cases, Heaven is said to respond to certain human actions or to send a warning. These two statements show that a relationship between natural deviations and human conduct is assumed in the *Gongyang zhuan*. Despite this assumption, however, there is no attempt to use these records to support historical judgments. Instead, most of the entries about natural calamities or anomalies are not commented on at all. At most, the *Gongyang zhuan* explains that this is an entry concerning a natural calamity or an anomaly.

How meaningful are these absences? A comparison of the different versions of a set of orders supposedly dictated to the regional lords by the hegemon Lord Huan of Qi 齊桓公 (r.

---

[82] Wen 9.1 (Liu 2011: 301; *SSJZS* 13: 2269).

[83] Pu Weizhong devotes a whole chapter of his doctoral thesis to this theme: Pu 1992: 150–152.

[84] Xi 15.11 (Liu 2011: 229; *SSJZS* 11: 2254), Xuan 15.9 (Liu 2011: 373; *SSJZS* 16: 2287), and probably also the last record, Ai 14.1.

686–643) and narrated in the *Mengzi*, the *Guanzi* (“Da kuang” 大匡 and “Ba xing” 霸形 chapters), the *Guliang zhuan* (Xi 9.4), and the *Gongyang zhuan* (Xi 3.5) reveals that precisely those orders in the Mencian version that concern the topics of filial piety (誅不孝, the selection of worthies (尊賢育才, 取士必得), virtue (彰有德), and welfare (敬老慈幼) are not present in the parallel passage in the *Gongyang zhuan*.

Here is the *Mengzi*’s version:

> 初命曰：『誅不孝，無易樹子，無以妾為妻。』再命曰：『尊賢育才，以彰有德。』三命曰：『敬老慈幼，無忘賓旅。』四命曰：『士無世官，官事無攝，取士必得，無專殺大夫。』五命曰：『無曲防，無遏糴，無有封而不告。』
>
> The first order was “Punish unfilial sons; do not replace rightful heirs; do not make concubines into wives.” The second was “Honor the worthy and train the talented to give distinction to the virtuous.” The third was “Respect the aged and be kind to the young; do not neglect visitors and travelers.” The fourth was “*Shi* should not hold hereditary offices; two different offices should not be held concurrently by the same official; the selection of *shi* officials must be successful; a regional lord should not by his own authority execute a great officer.” The fifth was “Dikes should not be crooked; the sale of grain should not be prohibited; any enfeoffment should be reported.” (*Mengzi* 12.7: 287–288)

The *Gongyang zhuan* (Xi 3.5) has only parts 2 and 3 of the first order and parts 1 and 2 of the fifth order:

> 桓公曰：「無障谷，無貯粟，無易樹子，無以妾為妻。」

> Lord Huan said: "Valleys should not be obstructed; grain should not be hoarded; rightful heirs should not be replaced; concubines should not be taken as wives."[85]

Most of the topics mentioned only in the *Mengzi* version are exactly those that are conspicuously absent in the *Gongyang zhuan*. Although the *Mengzi* passage appears to be spurious for several reasons,[86] it allows us, even if it is an invented speech, to draw the following conclusions. The *Gongyang* passage, like the similar *Guanzi* "Ba xing" passage, might be an earlier, and perhaps more authentic, version of Duke Huan's orders. In this case, the absence of the topics could be explained historically: the topics were not yet relevant at

---

[85] Liu 2011: 200; *SSJZS* 10: 2248. 無障谷 accords to 無曲防 and 無貯粟 accords to 無遏糴.

[86] First, the *Zuo zhuan* does not quote any element of it and instead adduces another quotation from Lord Huan at the Kuiqiu 葵丘 meeting in Xi 3.5. Second, Yuri Pines (2005c: 215–217) has pointed out that most ideas proposed in the *Mengzi* version are incompatible with Springs-and-Autumns period practices but are likely to have been invented in Warring States times. However, the *Gongyang* and *Guanzi* "Ba xing" versions contain none of the topics that Pines finds doubtful. These versions might therefore represent the earliest, and perhaps authentic, core of the speech, which was then expanded in different stages as reflected in the *Guliang* and *Mengzi* versions. Third, the speech is connected to different historical contexts. Whereas *Mengzi* and *Guliang* relate it to the covenant meeting at Kuiqiu in 651, *Gongyang* (which, like *Zuo zhuan*, is highly critical of Lord Huan's attitude at the Kuiqiu meeting yet praises his concern for the Central States at earlier meetings in its commentary to Xi 9.4) prefers to link these orders (which it endorses) to one of these earlier meetings, the meeting at Yanggu 陽穀 in 657. In *Guanzi* "Ba xing" Lord Huan declares these orders to the King of Chu when he meets him at Shaoling 召陵 in 656 (*Guanzi* IX.22: 460), and *Guanzi* "Da kuang" does not connect it to any concrete historical event but just writes that "the ruler thereupon spread them [the orders] among the regional lords" 君乃布之於諸侯 (*Guanzi* VII.18: 365). The speech thus serves to demonstrate Lord Huan's commitment and/or strength, but it is not coherently linked to a concrete historical moment.

the time this passage was written, and therefore, the passage reflects an earlier ideological position that is not concerned with these topics. Alternatively, the *Gongyang* passage could be a reduced form of a longer speech that we find in more complete versions in the *Guliang zhuan* and the *Mengzi*. Then the absences of those topics are meaningful silences that have to be interpreted as specific statements of a particular ideological position which is very much concerned with these topics.[87] In both cases, however, the topics are not an articulate part of the ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan*.

[L3] The Ideology Expressed through the Absences

The missing critical reflection on ritual might reveal a position that takes ritual to be a transmitted set of fixed rules that have to be followed unquestioningly. The focus on the meaning of ritual does not lie in the personal realm of emotions (*qing* 情) or intentions (*zhi* 志) but rather in the realm of the sociopolitical hierarchy of aristocratic positions.

The term "virtue" (*de* 德) is not found in the *Gongyang zhuan* probably because the commentary espouses a political system that is not founded on personal qualities like virtue (*de*) but rather on general rules of power and duty, a system in which there is no space for the unfolding of someone's individual *de*.

The absence of the words "loyalty" (*zhong* 忠) and "filial piety" (*xiao* 孝) seems to point in the same direction. We do find expressions like "the Way of the son" (*zi dao* 子道)

---

[87] In the last part of the excavated text *San de* 三德 from the Shanghai Museum collection there is a list of twenty-five prohibitions among which we find the following four: "Do not dam the rivers, do not cut off the ponds, do not annihilate the clans, do not deplete the granaries" 毋壅川，毋斷洿。毋滅宗，毋虛牀[藏]。(slip 10). This long list proves that a great variety of such prohibitions circulated during the late Warring States period. The occurrence of a set of verbatim identical prohibitions is therefore particularly meaningful.

and "the righteousness of ruler and minister" (*jun chen zhi yi* 君臣之義). However, these expressions (as well as the expression *xiao zi* 孝子 in Wen 9.1) define the relationships as part of a greater system of ritual behavior and not as *personal* relationships. Any loyal action toward the ruler is correct not on grounds of a personal relationship but as a duty within a system of ritual rules. In the view of the *Gongyang zhuan*, loyalty is owed to the system, not to an individual.[88] Therefore, terms like the "Way" (*dao* 道) and "righteousness" (*yi* 義) (which are also used in the *Gongyang zhuan* for typical normative institutions of the ritual system such as "the Way of old" 古之道, "the Way of Yao and Shun" 堯舜之道, "the Way of *yin*" 陰之道, "the righteousness of calendric beginning and end" 終始之義, "the righteousness of noble officers" 大夫之義, "the righteousness of regional lords" 諸侯之義, or, indeed, "the righteousness of the *Chunqiu*" 春秋之義) are used to describe the kind of loyalty devoted to the ritual system as a whole and thus an intrinsic part of it. Although the term *xin* 信 is used in the *Gongyang zhuan*, it never refers to a concept of loyalty that implies "unconditional obedience" or "personal fidelity directed to the ruler," unlike in the Springs-and-Autumns period (Chunqiu 春秋, 770–453).[89] In the *Gongyang zhuan*, *xin* 信 always denotes trustworthiness and reliability in being true to one's word. It is mainly used in the

[88] This attitude is similar to what Pines (2002b: 70) finds in the *Xunzi*: "Xunzi advocated institutional, rather than personal loyalty to the sovereign; the ruler had to be served and protected because he was a ruler, the pinnacle of political and social order, and not because of his personal features. This depersonalization of loyalty side-stepped the concept of ruler-minister friendship, so highly praised by Zhanguo *shi*."

[89] Pines 2002b: 45, 52. "Two different concepts of loyalty coexisted in the Chunqiu period: the intelligent and selfless loyalty of the ministers, directed to the state, and the personal fidelity of the retainers, directed to the master" (52).

context of covenants (*meng* 盟) and promises (*yue* 約) in contrast to cheating (*qi* 欺) and in one instance even refers to the *Chunqiu* as a trustworthy historical record (*xinshi* 信史).[90]

The topos of the necessity of "selecting worthy ministers" (*qiu xian* 求賢) suggests that a good government depends on individual qualities of officials, which again presupposes a personal system, which the *Gongyang zhuan* wants to avoid. If a minister is praised by the *Gongyang zhuan*, it is only because he did his duty in accordance with the ritual rules. Although Lord Huan of Qi is evaluated very positively, his meritorious minister Guan Zhong 管仲 (d. 645 BCE) plays no role in the *Gongyang zhuan*. Merits that are ascribed to Guan Zhong in texts like the *Guoyu* 國語 and the *Guanzi* are ascribed to Lord Huan of Qi in the *Gongyang zhuan*. Thus, the absence of the topic of worthies is due to the emphasis on the role of the ruler and the rejection of a political system that depends on, and praises, the quality of single individuals.[91]

---

[90] "The trustworthiness of the recorders/records of the *Chunqiu* lies exactly in the fact that the sequence [of the historical actors] is determined by [the hegemons,] Lord Huan [of Qi] and Lord Wen [of Jin], and the meetings [recorded] are those arranged by the leaders of the meetings. My own, Qiu's [i.e., Confucius's], guilt lies only in the wording《春秋》之信史也，其序則齊桓、晉文，其會則主會者為之，其詞則丘有罪焉爾 (*GYZ*, Zhao 12.1; Liu 2011: 531; *SSJZS* 22: 2320). This saying implies that Confucius in his compilation of the historical records did not alter the sequence of participants in alliances and meetings, which was determined by contemporaneous leaders; his alterations of the texts concern only minor details, the "wording." The historical content of the records is therefore "trustworthy." For identifying "wording" as Confucius's possible "guilt," see *Mengzi* 6.9: 155.

[91] Queen (2013b) writes accordingly: "The *Gongyang* narratives deem most praiseworthy ministers who subjugate their personal desires and concerns, demonstrating loyalty to their lords and service to their states above all other concerns. The independent and confident voice of the ministerial class, which is such a prominent feature of the *Zuo*, is strikingly absent in

The focus on ritual and moral virtues seems to exclude the discursive field of penalties and punishments as well as political techniques on the basis of a conceptual opposition that is often drawn between these fields as, for example, in the *Lunyu* 論語:

> 道之以政, 齊之以刑, 民免而無恥; 道之以德, 齊之以禮, 有恥且格.
>
> Guide them by means of governmental regulations and keep them in order by means of punishments and the people will evade those but lack shame. Guide them by means of virtue and keep them in order by means of ritual and they will have a sense of shame and also keep to the rules. (*Lunyu* 2.3: 12)

A government that is ordered by a perfect set of ritual rules does not need to emphasize punishments or any other religious, military, or political techniques. Violence, including punishments, executions (*zhu* 誅), and various forms of justified battles (for which, see Yu 2010), is sanctioned as a crucial means to protect, enact, and even enforce the ritual system. But it is not part of the ideological discourse. There is also no necessity for considerations of welfare or poverty, since the people will be well only if the rules are applied correctly and everyone fulfills his duties in accordance with his specific social position. Hence, welfare is not a central concern in the *Gongyang zhuan*.

Finally, the *Gongyang zhuan* bases its ideology of a perfect order on the system of rules authorized by King Wen and on the virtues deriving from the morality of the human heart. Heaven is recognized as an agent that has to be respected, but it does not provide a model for human action. The practice of not talking about supernatural phenomena reflects an attitude ascribed to Confucius in the *Lunyu* (Gentz 2012). Sima Qian 司馬遷 (ca. 145–ca. 85)

---

the *Gongyang Commentary*, where instead we find a more compliant and subservient vision of service."

writes in his “Tian guan” 天官 chapter: “Confucius expounded upon the Six Classics, he recorded anomalies but did not write down any interpretations” 孔子論六經，紀異而說不書 (*Shiji* 27: 1343). Throughout the two most often quoted texts in early Confucian literature, the *Shujing* 書經 (*Classic of Documents*) and the *Shijing* 詩經 (*Classic of Poems*), we likewise find almost no theoretical explanations of supernatural events.[92] The *Gongyang zhuan* seems to uphold the same basic attitude of keeping silent about things unknown.

Considering all these absent topoi—and there are more—as part of a distinct ideological stance, the *Gongyang zhuan* reveals a very particular view that does not reflect any of the traditionally defined school positions of Warring States or Han China. It certainly is a Ru (Confucian) position, but it can neither be placed in the bipolar tension between Mengzi and Xunzi nor be affiliated with any of the approaches ascribed to Confucius’s students such as Zengzi 曾子, Zisi 子思, and so forth. The abundant quotation of ritual rules shows that the *Gongyang zhuan* has to be positioned in a sphere of ritual expertise. The *Gongyang zhuan* seems to represent a position that had no strong representation in the Warring States period. Moreover, since the *Gongyang zhuan* in the Former Han was read through the interpretation of Huwu Zidu and Dong Zhongshu, who read it in their own ways, and since all later readings, even until today, base themselves on the interpretation of the Late

[92] The calamities sent down by Heaven that are reported in the *Shangshu* are always man-made: invasions, rebellions, usurpations, etc. We never find any natural calamity or anomaly described as being sent down by Heaven as a response to human conduct, in order to punish or to warn, such as we often find in later texts (the violent storm in the “Jin teng” 金縢 chapter might be the only exception; see also Luo Xinhui’s chapter in the present volume). In the *Shijing* there is one eclipse of the sun, which results from bad human conduct (*Shijing*, “Shi yue zhi jiao” 十月之交, Mao 193). Apart from this instance, we only find good harvests as an unspecific indicator of good government and regular sacrifice.

Han commentary of He Xiu 何休 (129–182 CE) (see below), the original position has never been recognized as a distinct and independent one.

Defining its ideological stance, we have to place it somewhere between a traditional person-centered monarchy, in which the concepts of virtue (*de*), loyalty, and filial piety are central, and a new, impersonal system operating on the basis of an abstract set of highly efficient ruling techniques and bureaucratic rules. Taking an intermediate approach, it maintains and redefines the traditional hierarchy of aristocratic positions. It defines these positions on the basis of a system of abstract ritual rules to which everyone has to submit without exception. However, for certain special situations, special solutions have to be found by means of moral discretion. Moral decisions are expedient either because they serve pragmatic solutions or because they accord with human qualities such as indulgence, pity, benevolence, and righteousness. By these means, the fixed ritual system loses its rigidity and attains a flexibility that opens up space for a human and pragmatic perspective that is needed in particular situations to make the ritual system work. Besides these special cases, humanity and righteousness are fully embodied within the system of ritual rules, which, in normal cases, correspond to the human heart (*xin* 心). With an emphasis on ritual, which accords with the human heart and attaches little value to efficiency and success in terms of quantity, the *Gongyang zhuan* formulates a counterposition to a system of techniques (*shu* 術) of rulership and thereby clearly opposes what is usually identified as a "Legalist" approach. This does not mean that the *Gongyang zhuan* is hostile toward technique, but technique is clearly subordinated to ritual and has to serve it.

The *Gongyang zhuan*'s emphasis on ritual rules as the guiding sociopolitical force does resemble the Legalist emphasis on impersonal means of regulating the political sphere; but the text's simultaneous emphasis on moral sense as a counterbalance distinguishes it critically from Legalism. It refutes a technical approach to rituality that regards ritual as an

efficient tool that can be applied in any circumstances.[93] Indeed, it insists on grounding the ritual system in human values that cannot be dealt with technically. Ritual and morality both have their origin in the human heart and are not created as an artificial instrument of regulation. In this respect the *Gongyang zhuan* seems to be closer to Mengzi than to Xunzi.

It is only through the interpretation of the obvious absences in the *Gongyang zhuan* that we are able to define its position more clearly.

[L1] Early Han *Gongyang* Interpretation

We don't know exactly why the *Gongyang zhuan* rose to the position of the single most influential ideological text during the reign of Emperor Wu. It seems that both ideological and personal reasons played important roles in this process. Three *Gongyang* exegetes seem to have developed a level of intellectual discourse from their *Gongyang* studies that secured them high positions under the emperors Jing and Wu and attracted numerous students, many of whom in turn gained high posts. Huwu Zidu, who is credited by Dai Hong with creating a

---

[93] Ironically, the only position that is identified with a pure ritualist approach among the "Disputers of the Tao" (to borrow the apt title of A. C. Graham's 1989 book) is the Confucian position as defined by its opponents. See, for example, the chapter "Against the Ru" 非儒 in the *Mozi* (IX.39: 437) and the "Discussion on the Ru" 論儒 in the *Yantie lun* 鹽鐵論 (II.11: 150), where the critic says that "Confucius was able to be square but unable to be round [i.e., flexible]" 孔子能方不能圓. However, extant Confucian texts show a different approach. For instance, the exegetical effort to keep the ritual rules flexible in works like the *Yili* is obvious in the related chapters of the *Liji* (Gentz 2010). The fact that Confucius dissociates himself explicitly from such a rigid approach in a statement like "The Master said: '"Ritual," they say. "Ritual," they say. But do they just talk about jade and silk? "Music," they say. "Music," they say. But do they just talk about bells and drums?'" 子曰:「禮云禮云!玉帛云乎哉!樂云樂云!鍾鼓云乎哉!」(*Lunyu* 17.11: 185). This saying indicates that pure ritualist approaches existed among certain ritual experts and were of immediate concern for Confucians.

written version of the *Gongyang* (see above), is probably the first *Gongyang* scholar to receive an official post as an Erudite at court during the reign of Emperor Jing (*Shiji* 121: 3118). Among his many disciples, Gongsun Hong 公孫弘 (200–121) was the most famous.

Rising to the position of imperial chancellor in 124 under Emperor Wu, Gongsun Hong was probably the first Confucian scholar ever to be elevated to the top of the Han government apparatus in recognition of his mastery of a canonical text. Gongsun Hong reportedly came from a poor background and made a living by tending pigs. Having studied the *Gongyang zhuan* in his forties he was able to submit a response to Emperor Wu's call for advice from "men of proficiency and fine quality" (*xianliang* 賢良) and "men of learning" (*wenxue* 文學) in 141 or 134, which led to his appointment as Academician (*boshi* 博士) and to further senior posts (Loewe 2011: 55; Vankeerberghen 2001: 19–20). Gongsun Hong's elevation was therefore taken as a sign by his contemporaries that Confucian education had become an attractive career option for everyone during Emperor Wu's reign. Sima Qian (who despised Gongsun Hong as a sycophant) notes sarcastically that "when Gongsun Hong, because of his *Chunqiu* learning, rose from a commoner to one of the three highest officers of the Son of Heaven and was enfeoffed as Marquis of Pingjin, the scholars of the world all followed as blown by this wind" 公孫弘以《春秋》白衣為天子三公，封以平津侯。天下之學士靡然鄉風矣 (*Shiji* 121: 3118). Yet, if we read Gongsun Hong's petitions and responses, we find no reference to the *Chunqiu* or the *Gongyang zhuan*. His elevation to one of the highest official posts might be interpreted as an expression of Emperor Wu's openness to and respect for some Confucian scholars, but in no way does it indicate the status or official usage of the *Gongyang zhuan* during Emperor Wu's reign.

Matters are slightly different with the third of the important early *Gongyang* scholars, Dong Zhongshu, who was a contemporary of both Huwu Zidu and Gongsun Hong and of whom Sima Qian writes that "in the whole period from the foundation of Han until the fifth of

its emperors it was only Dong Zhongshu who gained a reputation for exposition of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. It was he who transmitted the explanations of Mr. Gongyang."[94] Like Huwu Zidu, Dong was appointed as Academician under Emperor Jing. Under Emperor Wu he was selected as a "man of proficiency and fine quality" (*xianliang zhi shi* 賢良之士) and then sent as counselor (*xiang* 相) to the two kingdoms of Jiangdu 江都 and Jiaoxi 膠西. He never held a senior position at the center, was sentenced to death and then pardoned, and only slowly won the sympathy of the emperor. One of his greatest achievements is described by Ban Gu in the following terms:

> 瑕丘江公受穀梁春秋及詩於魯申公，傳子至孫為博士。武帝時，江公與董仲舒並。仲舒通五經，能持論，善屬文。江公吶於口，上使與仲舒議，不如仲舒。而丞相公孫弘本為公羊學，比輯其議，卒用董生。於是上因尊公羊家，詔太子受公羊春秋，由是公羊大興。
>
> Eminency Jiang of Xiaqiu received instruction in the *Guliang Chunqiu* and the *Poems* from Sire Shen of Lu, transmitting this to his sons and grandsons and becoming an Academician. In the time of Emperor Wu, Eminency Jiang was in a position that was on a par with Dong Zhongshu's. Zhongshu was conversant with the Five Classics, capable of sustaining an argument and accomplished at written composition; Eminency Jiang suffered from stuttering. The emperor ordered him to engage in discussion with Zhongshu, whom he did not match.
>
> Gongsun Hong the chancellor was basically a student of *Gongyang* and compared and collected his interpretations; in the end those of Scholar Dong were adopted. Thereupon the emperor respected the *Gongyang* specialists and decreed that

[94] *Shiji* 121: 3128; translation mainly following Loewe 2011: 47.

his heir apparent should be instructed in *Gongyang Chunqiu*. From this point onward the *Gongyang* was promoted on a large scale.[95]

If we believe Ban Gu's report, then the promotion of the *Gongyang zhuan* to the leading classic of the Former Han (Hiraoka 1983: 23) must have happened gradually as Han *Gongyang* exegetes convinced Emperor Wu of the value of their teachings by proving themselves superior to other scholars. Yet the persuasion could be successful only if the ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan* was able to serve the emperor's political goals.

We do not have enough evidence to know which part of the *Gongyang* ideology was most attractive to Emperor Wu. We can only speculate that the *Gongyang zhuan*'s strong emphasis on the exclusivity and universality of the authority of the Son of Heaven fitted Emperor Wu's program of renewed centralization; the distinction between interior (*nei* 內) and exterior (*wai* 外), between the Central States and the barbarians (Yi-Di), could be used to support territorial expansion;[96] and the prohibition against aristocrats and noble officers acting on their own authority (*zhuan* 專) perfectly responded to the Former Han tension between the emperors and the territorial kings. And insofar as this ideological support was couched in the language of emulating the revered Zhou past and invoked Confucius's wisdom, it made the emperor's policy much more acceptable to the members of the educated elite than was the case during the Qin dynasty.

However, the sources do not indicate that anyone interpreted the *Gongyang zhuan* in this way. Neither Huwu Zidu nor Dong Zhongshu held positions that would have allowed

---

[95] *Hanshu* 88: 3617; translation mainly following Loewe 2011: 151.

[96] As explained above, this goes against the original aim of the *Gongyang zhuan*, and Dong Zhongshu therefore was able to use the same *Gongyang zhuan* to heavily criticize Emperor Wu's expansionist policy.

them to put their ideas into practice. Moreover, Dong Zhongshu did not provide *Gongyang* material to support Emperor Wu's politics but mainly used its humanitarian values to protest against Emperor Wu's political moves. He opposed the aggressive expansionist policy, took exception to the oppressive methods of taxation, and criticized rigid laws and the imbalance of wealth. "That he aroused animosities and anger, followed by indictment and effective banishment need hardly surprise us," writes Loewe (2011: 75). Gongsun Hong, in contrast, held a position in which he could implement his own ideas. However, when he disapproved of Emperor Wu's politics against the Xiongnu, he resigned his office (to be appointed again several years later). In his political performance we can hardly detect any *Gongyang* ideology.

One area, however, in which we do see an application of *Gongyang* ideology is the legal realm. The *Gongyang* reading of the *Chunqiu* opened up the possibility of a legal interpretation of historical precedents. The *Chunqiu* could thus serve as a potential replacement of the Qin legal code in certain respects, and it is probably not a coincidence that the case of Liu An 劉安, the last of the powerful territorial kings, who sponsored the production of the famous text *Huainanzi* 淮南子, was supported by a *Gongyang* interpretation of an analogous *Chunqiu* case (*Shiji* 118: 3094; Vankeerberghen 2001: 31). In the course of the Han, the jurisdiction based on the "righteousness of the *Chunqiu*" (*Chunqiu zhi yi* 春秋之義) became widely applied to legal cases (Tanaka 1994; Wallacker 1985; Arbuckle 1987; Queen 1996). The transformation of the *Chunqiu* into a lawbook became possible through the further development of *Gongyang* exegesis into a *Chunqiu* handbook of legal cases ascribed to Dong Zhongshu, the *Chunqiu jueyu* 春秋訣獄 (*Deciding Cases by the Chunqiu*).[97] The

[97] The book is referred to by different titles. In Ruan Xiaoxu's 阮孝緒 (479–536 CE) *Qi lu* 七錄, it is called *Chunqiu duanyu* 春秋斷獄; in the bibliographic chapter ("Yiwenzhi" 藝文志) of the *Hanshu* (30: 1714) and in *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽 (984 CE; *juan* 640, vol. 3:

Chunqiu jueyu is a handbook of lawsuits of which only fragments have survived. Using the technical terminology of the Qin and early Han legal and administrative rules (such as those found on excavated manuscripts from Tomb 11, Shuihudi 睡虎地; from Tomb 247, Zhangjiashan 张家山; and from the collection of the Yuelu 岳麓 Academy), legal cases are formulated in an abstract and generalized way in order to function as general precedents. Principles of the *Chunqiu* are then referred to as basic guidelines for the judgment of a case. This book reflects an important stage in the process of what has been called "the Confucianization of the Law."[98] We should be careful not to overestimate the authority of the *Chunqiu* in legal decisions, however. Sima Qian tells us that the commandant of justice Zhang Tang 張湯, who was involved in the trial of Liu An, employed students and court Erudites familiar with the *Chunqiu* to help in deciding on doubtful points of the law. Yet Sima Qian, who presents Zhang Tang as an example of a "harsh official" 酷吏 in chapter 122 of the *Shiji*, leaves no doubt that Zhang did so only because the emperor at this time showed great fondness for literature and learning and Zhang thought it opportune to "back up his decision with references of the classics" 欲傅古義 (*Shiji* 122: 3139). In other words, Sima Qian believed that the classics were often used as mere ornamental backups.

2868), it is called *Gongyang Dong Zhongshu zhiyu* 公羊董仲舒治獄. In the bibliographic ("Jingjizhi" 經籍志) chapter of the *Suishu* 隨書 (32: 930), it is called *Chunqiu jueshi* 春秋決事, also in Ma Guohan's 馬國翰 (1794–1857), *Yuhan shanfang jiyi shu* 玉函山房輯佚書 (Ma Guohan 1990: vol. 3, 246–247) and, in the most detailed edition, in Cheng Shude's 程樹德 (1877–1944), *Hanlü kao* (Cheng Shude 1988: chap. 6). In the *Chongwen zongmu* 崇文總目 (1041 CE), it is called *Chunqiu jueshi bibing* 春秋決事比并. Translations may be found in Wallacker 1985; Arbuckle 1987; and Queen 1996.

[98] See Goldin 2012 for a critical review.

Dong Zhongshu is also the alleged author of another work, the *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露. In the first seventeen chapters of this book, which contain material authored by Huwu Zidu, Dong Zhongshu, or the latter's immediate disciples,[99] the *Gongyang* exegesis is further developed to adapt it to Former Han needs. These chapters formulate a new Former Han *Gongyang* ideology. One of the main innovative features of these chapters is that political topics absent from the *Gongyang zhuan* discourse are introduced into *Chunqiu* exegesis. Among these are moral instruction and moral transformation (*jiao/hua* 教/化), change of institutions (*gaizhi* 改制), the opposition of "refined" (*wen* 文) and "substantial" (*zhi* 質), "the people" (*min* 民), punishments (*xing* 刑), worthies (*xian* 賢), virtue (*de* 德), and, especially in chapter 6, new religious concepts such as Heaven (*tian* 天) as the utmost authority and model of orientation. Original *qi* (*yuanqi* 元氣), as well as cosmological theories of correspondence (all of which are conspicuously absent in the *Gongyang zhuan*, as we have seen above), are now introduced as well.

The new exegetical language used in these chapters differs strongly from the language of the *Gongyang zhuan*. A theoretical language is being developed in which new technical concepts of exegesis are formulated that stem from the context of speculative-logical discourse such as inference (*tui* 推), induction of general models or standards (*fa* 法), distinction of identical kinds (*yi tong lei* 異同類), discrimination of categories (*bie lei* 別類), differentiation of names and reality (*ming shi* 名實), distinction of right and wrong (*shi fei* 是

[99] For the history of the debate about the authenticity of the *Chunqiu fanlu*, see Arbuckle 1993: 316ff. Arbuckle (1993: 457–459) speculates that the material might come from the school of Huwu Zidu. See also Arbuckle 2004; Queen 1996: 45–49; and Gentz 2001: 406–408. Queen and Major will argue in their forthcoming translation of the *Chunqiu fanlu* that the material from the first five chapters comes from the hand of Dong Zhongshu and that the material from chapters 6–17 comes from Dong or his disciples.

非), connection of parallel cases (*guan bi* 貫比), estimation of intention (*gui zhi* 貴志), and so forth.[100] Abstract principles of exegesis are formulated on an exegetical metalevel that is based more on an interest in analytical topics than on a specific exegetical interest in single passages. On this abstract basis, legal and omenological exegesis is then also applied to the *Gongyang* reading of the *Chunqiu*.

The secular juridical appropriation of the *Chunqiu* in the legal realm is not very different from its political appropriation in the alleged religious realm of cosmological laws. Both applications are accomplished in contexts in which experts in textual interpretation, employing a specific technical language, use all their highly trained skill to base far-reaching decisions on the text of the *Chunqiu*. In contrast to earlier *Chunqiu* readings, however, they have recourse to clearly defined sets of rules, which are based not on personal wisdom or power but on transparent and explicit laws that gain their authority through their argumentative force in public debate.[101] This new methodological approach reflects an ideology that contradicts the ideology of the monarch's absolute power as it appears in the *Gongyang zhuan*.

A further stage of Former Han *Gongyang* exegesis is the attempt to create lists of the essential principles of the *Chunqiu* as reflected in chapters 10–12 of the *Chunqiu fanlu*. Thus, "Ten Guiding Points" (*shi zhi* 十指) are presented in chapter 12 of the *Chunqiu fanlu* as essentials of the *Chunqiu*.[102] Chapter 23, "The Three Dynasties' Alternating Regulations of

---

[100] For a further analysis of this point, see Gentz 2009b.

[101] For more-detailed analyses of the changes in how the *Gongyang zhuan* was perceived during Han times following the work of Dong Zhongshu, see Gentz 2009a: 823–838; Cheng 1985; and esp. Huang Kaiguo 2013.

[102] For a fully annotated translation and analysis in the light of chapters 10 and 11, see Gentz 2001: 469–497. See also my English translation in Gentz 2009b: 69. For other English translations, see Feng 1952: vol. 2, 76; and Elman 1990: 174.

Substance and Refinement" (*Sandai gaizhi zhiwen* 三代改制質文), one of the late chapters of the *Chunqiu fanlu*,[103] grounds *Chunqiu* principles in cosmological correlations and classifies the ritual rules in a scheme of monthly ordinances. It further develops the important notion that the *Chunqiu* deals with matters of a new (true) king, regards the Zhou as an antecedent dynasty to that new king, and treats both the Shang and the Zhou as descendants of former (true) kings.[104] In the Eastern Han, He Xiu builds upon this idea of chapter 23[105] to formulate the first of his famous "Three Themes, Nine Aspects" (*sanke jiuzhi* 三科九旨) (Ojima 1990):

> 三科九旨者，新周、故宋，以《春秋》當新王，此一科三旨也。又云: 所見異辭，所聞異辭，所傳聞異辭，二科六旨也。又內其國而外諸夏，內諸夏而外夷狄，是三科九旨也。
>
> As to the three themes and nine aspects, to consider [the ritual status of] the Zhou as new [antecedent dynasty][106] and the [ritual status of] Song as remote [pre-antecedent

---

[103] Loewe dates chapter 23 to the first or second century CE. See Loewe 2011: 295, 309, with a full, annotated translation on 317–334; Queen 1996: 81.

[104] "The *Chunqiu* formulates matters of a New King, changes the Zhou institutions, adopts the Dispensation of Black [as the ruling color in a correlative cycle of governance] as orthodox, and regards the dynasties Yin [Shang] and Zhou as descendants of former [true] kings"《春秋》作新王之事，變周之製，當正黑統。而殷周為王者之後 (*Chunqiu fanlu* VII.23: 187, 199).

[105] As he mentions in his preface (*SSJZS*: 2191), He Xiu bases his commentary on Huwu Zidu's *Tiaoli* 條例, not on Dong Zhongshu's work (for further, detailed argumentation, see Duan Xizhong 2002: 12–23). This might indicate that chapter 23 of the *Chunqiu fanlu* comes from Huwu Zidu's school. Another possibility is that chapter 23 is so late that it in turn builds on He Xiu.

[106] The expression *xin Zhou* 新周 is taken from the *Gongyang* commentary to Xuan 16.2. He Xiu explains it in his subcommentary as referring to the new status of Zhou as the

dynasty], to take the *Chunqiu* as representing the new royal authority, this is one theme and three aspects. It further says: to use different wordings for what [Confucius] witnessed with his own eyes, what he heard about, and what he knew by traditional accounts, this is two themes and six aspects. Further, to regard one's own state as interior and all the Xia as exterior, to regard all the Xia as interior and the Yi-Di as exterior, this is three themes and nine aspects.[107]

The topic of revenge (*fuchou* 復讎), which appears in three passages of the *Gongyang zhuan* as a subtopos in discussions on the relationship between duties to the ruler and to the father, is not yet regarded as important in all these early lists. It becomes prominent as a theme of the *Gongyang zhuan* probably in Tang 唐 (618–907 CE) or Song 宋 (960–1279 CE) times (Chen Dengwu 2003; Li Longxian 2012, chap. 3) and is still regarded as one of the

---

antecedent of what the *Chunqiu* regards as new royal authority (the authority expressed by the rules in the *Chunqiu* and soon to be realized by the Han). The *Chunqiu fanlu* parallel in chapter 23 (*Chunqiu fanlu* VII.23: 189) uses *qin* 親 (being proximate) rather than *xin* 新 (new) as a qualifier for Zhou in the phrase 親周、故宋 (and the combination of 親 and 故 recurs also in a number of other cases in the same chapter). He Xiu also uses the formulation 新周、故宋 in his commentary to Zhuang 27.6 (*SSJZS* 8: 2239.3). See the detailed discussions in Duan Xizhong 2002: 467–480; and Huang Kaiguo 2013: 104–108.

[107] See Xu Yan's subcommentarial preface to the *Gongyang zhuan* (*SSJZS*: 2195.3), where he quotes this text from He Xiu's *Wenshili* 文謚例 (now lost). The last two themes are verbatim quotations from the *Gongyang zhuan*. The second theme can be found in Yin 1.7 (Liu 2011: 10; *SSJZS* 1: 2200), Huan 2.4 (Liu 2011: 56; *SSJZS* 4: 2213), and Ai 14.1 (Liu 2011: 650; *SSJZS* 28: 2353). The third theme is quoted from Cheng 15.12 (Liu 2011: 417; *SSJZS* 18: 2297).

central *Gongyang* topics in the Qing, along with the topic of dealing with the "barbarians" and magnifying unified rule, which are still considered relevant today.[108]

He Xiu's commentary forms the endpoint of Han *Gongyang* studies. In contrast to the enthusiastic vision of the Han starting at the beginning of a new dynastic cycle, which finds expression in Former Han writings by Dong Zhongshu and some chapters of the *Chunqiu fanlu*, He Xiu, looking at a declining dynasty at the end of the Later Han, develops a messianic vision that, probably influenced by early Daoist ideas, is linear and more teleological than cyclical.[109] In his subcommentary to Yin 1.7, He interprets the Three Ages of *Chunqiu* transmission (*sanshi* 三世)[110] as the early ages of "Decline and Disorder" (*shuailuan* 衰亂) where in the *Chunqiu* Confucius focuses only on the state of Lu, of "Approaching Peace" (*shengping* 昇平) where Confucius distinguishes the inner Central States from the barbarian exterior, and of the most recent ages of "Great Peace" (*da/taiping* 大平) where Confucius (who witnessed this age with his own eyes) envisions "the barbarian tribes becoming promoted to [Zhou] aristocratic ranks, and All-under-Heaven, far and near, large and small, being like one" 夷狄進至於爵，天下遠近小大若一 (*SSJZS* 1: 2200).[111] Derk Bodde (1981: 250) holds this theory to be "the first in Chinese thought which explicitly recognizes the possibility of positive human progress according to a fixed pattern of historical

---

[108] For a discussion of the Qing and contemporary *Gongyang* reception, see Gentz 2001: 241–248; Sun 1985; Chen Qitai 1997; Ding Ya 2002; Huang Kaiguo 2013: 250–407.

[109] Cheng 1985: 207–223, esp. 215, 221–223.

[110] See the second theme above: "what [Confucius] witnessed with his own eyes [events during the reigns of Lords Zhao, Ding, and Ai], what he heard about [events during the reigns of Lords Wen, Xuan, Cheng, and Xiang], and what he knew by traditional accounts [events during the reigns of Lords Yin, Huan, Zhuang, Min, and Xi]" 所見異辭，所聞異辭，所傳聞異辭.

[111] For a full translation of He's commentary, see Cheng 1985: 209–212.

evolution." He Xiu's subcommentary terminates, fixes, and preserves the Han *Gongyang* tradition and forms, as Anne Cheng (1985: 15, 269) asserts, a kind of "*summa*" of the New Text school without which the great interest in this school by Qing scholars would never had been aroused. Prior to the Qing resurrection, there was a long age of gradual decline of New Text studies in general and of *Gongyang* studies in particular. The latter remained fully dominated by a single exegetical tradition, that of He Xiu.[112] Han Yu, who, as mentioned above (n. 39), was aware of the *Gongyang zhuan* exegesis, writes in a letter:

> 近世公羊學幾絕。何氏注外不見他書。
>
> In recent times, *Gongyang* studies have almost ceased. Besides Mr. He's commentary there are no other writings in view. (Quoted in Chen Qitai 1997: 57)

[L1] Conclusion

The *Gongyang zhuan* is one of the great founding texts of the Han Empire. It emphasizes political unity (*da yitong* 大一統) and affirms the power of the ruler's position by identifying him squarely with the state as sharing "the same body" (*guo jun yiti* 國君一體).[113] Looking at the overall ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan* as an ideology of power, I have attempted to present a more differentiated picture in which the ideal of a true king exists only as a model within a highly formalized ritual scheme of power stratifications. Historical reality is set up as a systematic corrective to this ritual ideal. The *Gongyang zhuan* constructs a conceptual tension between the ideal ruler (whose position is defined within a model scheme of rules allegedly reflecting the Zhou ritual order) and actual historical rulers (as they appear in the

---

[112] For a short history of the decline of *Gongyang* studies between the Late Han and the early Qing, see Huang Kaiguo 2013: 237–249.

[113] *GYZ*, Zhuang 4.4 (Liu 2011: 112; *SSJZS* 6: 2226).

Chunqiu records). This tension is paralleled in an exegetical technique that constructs a similar relationship between an ideal pattern of the canonical text of the *Chunqiu* (that is based on a set of historiographical principles allegedly reflecting the Zhou ritual order) and its actual records (reflecting Zhou historical reality). We find the same tension in the criteria for meting out praise and blame to the historical protagonists' behavior: to explain a judgment, the *Gongyang zhuan* refers either to an ideal system of ritual rules (allegedly reflecting the Zhou ritual order) or to historical moral narratives (allegedly reflecting Confucius's moral sense in cases where no ritual rules apply). The *Gongyang zhuan* thereby offers a way of dealing with the schematized model of an ideal past in the concrete reality of the present. It is the conscious methodological construction and the reconciliatory handling of these tensions in a political program targeting a strong central royal power that secured the power and influence of the *Gongyang zhuan*'s ideology throughout Former Han times.

To analyze the tension between the ideal of a true king and historical reality in the *Gongyang zhuan* I have identified in the *Gongyang zhuan* the twofold modes of, on the one hand, an ideal ritual order represented by a set of rules that describe and prescribe this ideal order and, on the other hand, a real situation that deviates in many respects from this ideal one. The *Gongyang zhuan* recognizes that the ideal order, which is identified with the ritual order of the Zhou, can neither be implemented technically as a rigidly closed system that responds to each situation nor be operated on a personal basis whereby success depends on the individual personality or qualification of the ruler (actually, the text repeatedly laments the absence of a [true] ruler during the age depicted by the *Chunqiu*). It therefore presents the ideal order of the ritual rules as the basic and primary pattern and guideline that should be followed as far as possible within the limits of historical reality since the Springs-and-Autumns period.

The *Gongyang zhuan* therefore offers an alternative means of determining the right or wrong of non-standard situations in cases where the ritual rules do not apply. A moral weighing that is based on the same values as the ritual rules will lead to the same judgments of right and wrong as the ritual rules do. This moral weighing as corrective for an inappropriate system of rules is in most cases associated with the person of the true minister (or historiographer). Relating the ritual system of King Wen to the morality of the human heart, the *Gongyang zhuan* offers a system of governance that, despite its emphasis on the role of the ruler, separates royal authority from the person of the ruler. Concepts that derive from a personified mode of rule, such as "virtue," "loyalty," "filial piety," "selecting worthy ministers," or, alternatively, any references to the authority of Heaven are therefore absent from the *Gongyang zhuan*. The ritual system, not the personality of King Wen, is important. Designed for situations where "there was no [true] Son of Heaven above," the *Chunqiu*, according to the *Gongyang zhuan*, defines an ideal realm of royal authority and power independent from the actual existence of an adequate ruler. In contrast to Han Fei's Legalist model, which also postulates an "opposition … between the human factor and the objective functioning of the system" and similarly tries to "protect the idea of monarchy from the monarch,"[114] this ideal realm is based not on newly established laws (*fa* 法) and techniques (*shu* 術) but on old "regulations and measures" (*fadu* 法度) and on moral sense.

Confucius, who demonstrates the application of these "regulations and measures" to the "reality" of historical materials in his editing of the *Chunqiu*, therefore, complements and accomplishes the work of King Wen, who purportedly established the ritual rules for the same purpose and in the same spirit. Moreover, by connecting historical narratives to ritual rules, Confucius creates a further discursive domain whereby he is able to discuss, include, and

[114] See Romain Graziani's chapter in the present volume.

reconcile deviations in the ritual system. Through this innovation he ensures the continuation of the power of the Zhou ideology in the same way as a true minister should ensure the power of his king. The ritual system of the Zhou cannot survive on its own. Neither can the Son of Heaven. Yet this system is the foundational framework within which morality moves. The integration of both is the vision of the *Gongyang zhuan*. Both approaches support and illuminate each other and generate a further dimension of the meaning of the Zhou ideology.

This further dimension of meaning is gained through the blending of slightly different aspects of the same ideology that, taken together, produce a depth that is cognitively not achievable by only one form of display. We may compare this with the difference between monaural and binaural hearing or between monocular and binocular vision: in both cases a further spatial dimension and depth of perception is gained when two sense organs blend their perceptions. Andreas Wagner (2007) has interpreted the function of parallelisms as lying in their creation of multiple perspectives that can be added paratactically and that through convergence open a space of cognition in which understanding can move in different directions and achieve a greater complexity of insight. The two eyes of the *Chunqiu*—King Wen's ritual rules and Confucius's morality—should, in the view of the *Gongyang zhuan*, enable the reader to see the ideology of the Zhou as a three-dimensional one that can "disperse the times of disorder and effect the return to the correct order," as "nothing comes closer to this than the *Chunqiu*" 撥亂世，反諸正，莫近諸《春秋》.[115]

The extant sources do not provide enough information as to exactly how and why this understanding of the *Chunqiu* developed, but the ideology of the *Gongyang zhuan* must have been so appealing to scholars and emperors during the Former Han that the *Chunqiu*—reportedly mainly mediated through the exegesis of Huwu Zidu and Dong Zhongshu—was elevated to be the leading classic of the dynasty. Paradoxically, the same *Gongyang zhuan*

[115] *GYZ*, Ai 14.1 (Liu 2011: 650; *SSJZS* 28: 2352–2354).

that supported Han rule was also used by *Gongyang* scholars like Dong Zhongshu to criticize the ruler.[116] This sheds new light on the kind of means on which rulers like Emperor Wu based their authority. Like many other canonical texts, the *Gongyang zhuan* could serve simultaneously to bolster the ruler's legitimacy but also to guide, moderate, and ultimately to restrict the ruler. This double function reflects well the perennial tension between the throne and the scholars who promulgated this text.

Limitations of space do not allow me to follow the fluctuations in the status of the *Gongyang zhuan* after the Han dynasty, including its resurrection to the position of a foundational ideological text in the late nineteenth century, especially in the writings of Kang Youwei 康有爲 (1858–1927).[117] Although the importance of this text—and *Chunqiu* studies in general—declined in the twentieth century, it was still taught as one of the most profound of all Confucian classics by scholars like Aisin-Gioro Yuyun 愛新覺羅毓鋆 (1908–2011) in Taiwan until the 1980s and is propagated as the most authoritative Confucian source for the conception of a New Confucian state by at least one PRC scholar (Jiang Qing 2013) even today.

---

[116] See on this point Huang Kaiguo 2013: 76–78, 136–139.

[117] At least three monographs were written on *Gongyang* studies in the Qing: Sun Chunzai 1985; Chen Qitai 1997; and Ding Ya 2002. For further reference, see also Elman 1990; and Huang Kaiguo 2013: 250–407.